

yesterday, June 30. The Alaskans who attended were Mary Lee Council, who represented Senator BARTLETT; Henry W. Clark, born in Wrangell; George Sundborg; and I. Don Greeley was there, representing Alaska's Representative in Congress, the Honorable RALPH RIVERS. Also there was Arthur Greeley, Deputy Chief of National Forest Resource Management, who succeeded Frank Heintzleman as Alaska's regional forester. The honorary pallbearers were E. L. BARTLETT, Samuel R. Broadbent, Allen R. Brumbaugh, Henry W. Clark, Robert A. Events, ERNEST GRUENING, D. Elmer Hawbaker, Enos H. Horst, RALPH RIVERS, Craig Truax, J. Irving Whalley, and Richard P. Zimmerman.

Frank Heintzleman's service to Alaska will be remembered by all who knew him, and will also be remembered after they pass from the scene, for both the cultural and the economic contributions whose benefits will continue long thereafter.

So I join in the affectionate tribute of my fellow Alaskans in saying, "Well done, thou good and faithful public servant."

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate two articles giving further proof of the infiltration of and influence of Communists and Communist sympathizers in the so-called civil rights groups and their riots and demonstrations in this country. One is an article from the July 1, 1965, issue of the Chicago Tribune entitled "Reds Foment School Row, Daley Claims—Assails Imported Troublemakers." The other is an Associated Press dispatch from Montgomery, Ala., as printed in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., on June 30, 1965. The headline reads "Alabama Legislative Probers Say Two Rights Groups Are Red-Inspired."

Mr. President, the assertion by the mayor of Chicago, the Honorable Richard Daley, that Communists and Communist funds are involved in the antischool demonstrations in Chicago cannot be tossed aside as coming from "another biased southern source." His attempts to help Negroes is beyond question.

The Chicago Tribune article reports that the deputy police superintendent, Joseph Morris, said that he had turned over to Mayor Daley's office information indicating that Communists are taking part in the demonstrations. The article quotes Mr. Morris as stating that police have checked more than 150 names of demonstrators, and at least 11 are Communists or members of Communist-front organizations.

The Alabama legislative report concludes that two so-called civil rights groups, the Congress of Racial Equality and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee are Communist inspired and that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is actively engaged in promoting the Communist line.

Mr. President, time and again I have presented evidence on the floor of the

U.S. Senate and also in the Commerce Committee which shows that there is Communist infiltration of and influence in the so-called civil rights groups and their demonstrations. The FBI Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has warned the Congress and the public about this danger. The President of the United States is aware of this problem. Even some of the liberal news columnists have admitted that there is Communist influence and infiltration of some of these groups and their demonstrations. Still, no action is taken by either the administration or the Congress to deal effectively with this danger. Why? Because the administration, and too many Members of the Congress, are playing too much politics with the so-called civil rights issue.

I urge again, Mr. President, that the President and the Congress immediately make this question of Communist infiltration and influence in the so-called civil rights groups the subject of a full and impartial investigation and let the chips fall where they may.

In closing my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks the articles from the Chicago Tribune and also from the Greenville News.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 1, 1965]
**REDS FOMENT SCHOOL ROW, DALEY CLAIMS—
 ASSAILS IMPORTED TROUBLEMAKERS**

Mayor Daley said yesterday that police files show that many marchers in Chicago's civil rights demonstrations are Communists and charged that Communist funds were helping finance the demonstrations.

He said that some of the troublemakers were drawn here by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which held hearings in Chicago in May.

"You know, those people take part in any disturbing thing they can," Daley said.

RABY LASHES BACK

Albert Raby, convenor of the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations and a prime mover of the demonstrations, accused Daley of "witch hunting."

"He's probably taking lessons from Governor Wallace," Raby said in an apparent reference to Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama. "I wish the mayor were as resolved to settle the school crisis as he is to participate in witch hunting."

The mayor defended his abrupt departure on Tuesday from a meeting he arranged between Raby's groups and the board of education. His leavetaking, in the middle of the 2-hour meeting, brought a blast of criticism from Raby.

"You must recognize that the mayor has appointments made in advance, and we sat with these people for 3 hours on Monday," Daley said.

He said that Raby's group, if they carry out their announced intention to hold night demonstrations, must observe the law.

VOWS OF LAW AND ORDER

"There will always be law and order in Chicago as long as Daley is mayor," he said.

When a reporter read excerpts from a Tribune editorial criticizing the demonstrations and stating that Chicago cannot put up with a government by ultimatum, Daley said:

"It is interesting to note that over 50 percent of the people in these marches are not Negroes, and yet Negroes are accused of this. I appeal to all decent people and to

their religious leaders to set the proper example by following the law. Without law we have anarchy."

Asked if he thought Communists dominate the marches, Daley said he could not answer the question. Observers have noted uniformed policemen taking pictures of the demonstrators every day.

Deputy Police Supt. Joseph Morris said he has turned over to the mayor's office information indicating that Communists are taking part in the demonstrations. He said police have "checked more than 50 names of demonstrators, and at least 11 are Communists or members of Communist-front organizations."

ADD TO POLICE LOAD

Meanwhile, Police Supt. O. W. Wilson disclosed that from June 10 through June 28 the demonstrations have taken up 31,856 man-hours of policemen's time.

If policemen were paid for this time the cost to the city would be \$109,287 for policing the demonstrations for the 19 days, Wilson said.

He said that days off canceled must be repaid to policemen, and this impairs the department's overall effectiveness in fighting crime.

Ninety pickets started a new march yesterday afternoon from Buckingham fountain in Grant Park to city hall to protest the school board's granting of a new contract to School Supt. Benjamin C. Willis.

Asked if there were Communists among the demonstrators, Raby said, "Not that I know of."

"But there are no political tests for membership in the civil rights movement," he said. "I don't ask people if they are Democrats or Republicans or Fascists or Communists."

AGREE WITH EDITORIAL

Three school board members—Thomas J. Murray, Cyrus H. Adams III, and Mrs. Wendell E. Green—said they agreed with the sentiments of the Tribune's editorial.

"They apparently came to Tuesday's meeting with the purpose of giving the board a good dressing down," said Murray. "I don't think they improved relationships between themselves and the board."

"I would hope that the leaders would finally decide this is not the type of example helpful to children," Mrs. Green said. "Children are supposed to be the beneficiaries of all this. I would hope these people would seek more constructive ways to resolve the problems."

Frank Whiston, school board president, said he was hopeful "some good will come out of sitting down and talking together."

The Lincoln Dental Society representing more than 150 Negro dentists in Chicago, issued a statement supporting the demonstrations and criticizing a "callous lack of sympathy by city officials regarding our city's long neglected school crisis."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News,
 June 30, 1965]

ALABAMA LEGISLATIVE PROBES SAY TWO RIGHTS GROUPS ARE RED-INSPIRED

MONTGOMERY, ALA.—A special legislative committee charged Tuesday that two civil rights organizations are Communist-inspired and that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is "actively engaged in promoting the Communist line."

King and another spokesman called the accusations witchhunting and typical southern reaction.

The five-member commission to preserve the peace made the allegations in a 39-page report to the Alabama Legislature—the body which created it 2 years ago after Birmingham's bloody racial demonstrations.

King, his Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Congress of Racial Equality, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating

July 1, 1965

Committee, were accused of promoting the Communist cause and being a threat to State and national sovereignty.

SNCC, the commission charged, is the most dangerous and is involved in a tug-of-war with King for control of the civil rights movement.

"Currently, the trend seems to be that King is in control of the older groups who have the money, but SNCC is getting the campus support and trying to force King to either get out or to lean further to the left," the report said.

It charged that SNCC is "extensively Communist dominated" and ultimately "must be smashed by legal action or we will court a major disaster."

SNCC, the commission charged, is "an extremely dangerous, irresponsible group which tends to promote acts of violence" to gain support for its own goals.

The commission cited paid SNCC performers as stating the organization "wanted violence—preferably to get some of its demonstrators killed in Alabama."

The commission, headed by Representative John Hawkins, said it obtained its information from staff members, part-time investigators, voluntary witnesses, and police.

FE *Church*
**PRAISE FOR SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S
SPEECH ON VIETNAM**

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Senator FULBRIGHT's fine speech on Vietnam recently has evoked much favorable editorial comment around the country. Representative of this comment is an excellent editorial written by Lee Ester, which was published on June 22 in the Idaho State Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD A SOLUTION

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT has proposed a sensible course for conducting war and seeking peace in South Vietnam. His proposals were set forth in a speech delivered in the Senate last Tuesday after a discussion the day before with President Johnson. They are worth study, therefore, not only for their own sake but for what they might reveal about the administration's intentions.

The Senator from Arkansas opened his speech by declaring his opposition to, first, unconditional American withdrawal from South Vietnam, and second, to further escalation of the war. He opposes withdrawal, he said, "because such action would betray our obligation to people we have promised to defend, because it would weaken or destroy the credibility of American guarantees to other countries, and because such a withdrawal would encourage the view in Peiping and elsewhere that guerrilla wars supported from outside are a relatively safe and inexpensive way of expanding Communist power." He opposes escalation because the bombing thus far of North Vietnam has failed to weaken the military capacity of the Vietcong in any visible way; because escalation would invite the intervention—or infiltration—on a large scale in great numbers of North Vietnamese troops; because this in turn would probably draw the United States into a bloody and protracted jungle war in which the strategic advantage would be with the other side; and, finally, because the only available alternative to such a land war would then be the further expansion of the air war to such an extent as to invite either massive Chinese military intervention in many vulnerable areas in southeast Asia or general nuclear war."

All of these are valid reasons for not pulling out of South Vietnam and for not intensifying the war there. These observations, however, do nothing to point the way to disengagement, which should be the long range aim of our policy in South Vietnam.

On that score, Senator FULBRIGHT offered two proposals. They will not, of course, satisfy those who want the United States to get out of Vietnam immediately or those who believe we could and should bring the Vietcong and North Vietnam to their knees, but they are sensible and realistic nonetheless. First, the Senator said, we must "sustain the South Vietnamese Army so as to persuade the Communists that Saigon cannot be crushed and that the United States will not be driven from South Vietnam by force," and second, "we must continue to offer the Communists a reasonable and attractive alternative to military victory. For the time being, it seems likely that the focus of our efforts will have to be on persuading the Communists that they cannot win a complete military victory; only when this has become clear is it likely they will respond to our proposals for unconditional negotiations."

The Senator sees the short-term outlook as by no means bright but neither is it without hope. He believes that if we are resolute but also restrained in the conduct of the war, the Communists may take a different view of our standing proposal for unconditional negotiations when the current Vietcong offensive has run its course without decisive result. When it becomes clear that neither side can expect to win a complete victory, "I would think it appropriate and desirable for the United States to reiterate forcefully and explicitly its willingness to negotiate a compromise peace and thereafter to join with other countries in mounting a large-scale program for the economic and social development of southeast Asia."

As if to remind the Nation—and possibly President Johnson, too—that the issues are not all black and white, Senator FULBRIGHT included this significant paragraph in his speech:

"The most striking characteristic of a great nation is not the mere possession of power but the wisdom and restraint and largeness of view with which power is exercised. A great nation is one which is capable of looking beyond its view of the world, or recognizing that, however convenient it may be of the beneficence of its own role and aims, other nations may be equally persuaded of their benevolence and good intent. It is a mark of both greatness and maturity when a nation like the United States, without abandoning its convictions and commitments, is capable at the same time of acknowledging that there may be some merit and even good intent in the views and aims of its adversaries."

We can only hope that in the months ahead our power will be exercised with wisdom, restraint, and largeness of view, that the forces of communism can be contained, and that when the opportunity arises, we will again express our willingness to negotiate. As matters now stand, that seems to be the best hope for peace.

AIR FORCE INVENTORY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would like to address the Senate today on a matter which I consider of utmost importance to the future of this Nation's aerial military capability.

During the past 48 hours, a portion of our mighty B-52 bomber fleet celebrated its 10th anniversary in the inventory of the Air Force. Although the Department of Defense during hearings earlier

this year indicated the 10-year-old bombers would be phased out of service within a short time, I am concerned that those later model B-52 aircraft not scheduled for early phaseout are not being modified rapidly enough to assure their retention in the force throughout their programed life of 10 additional years.

Overlooking the controversy of whether or not the high-altitude bombing raid in Vietnam last week actually proved successful, I would point to the fact that these long-range aircraft were used on a "milk run" where no fighter aircraft were expected and with no anticipation of antiaircraft defensive fire. Yet, in spite of this lack of opposition, we lost two aircraft destroyed while a third was forced to return to base because of mechanical problems.

My point, Mr. President, is whether these B-52 aircraft used in the Vietnam raid were our late model jet bombers or were they some of our 10-year-old aircraft? In testimony earlier this year, the Secretary of Defense indicated that 30 B-52A models—the earliest B-52 model—had been sent to Guam to replace B-47 jets scheduled for phaseout. The bombing raid originated from Guam. I repeat that I am not concerning myself today with the controversy over success or failure of the mission, I am only asking whether the aircraft we used were being maintained as well as they should when we lose approximately 10 percent to either flight error or mechanical failure.

We are relentlessly informed by the Department of Defense that the B-52 aircraft will remain in the Air Force inventory until sometime in the 1970's, yet the plane actually has been given no mission performance assignment. Testimony presented to the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this year corroborates that no specific mission has been programed for the B-52. I question, then, how it is possible to program any modification money for the aircraft if the specific mission isn't known by the Department of Defense.

The aircraft must be kept flying for another 10 years since our reluctance to proceed with other manned bomber designs leaves us with a gap in aerial bomber reserves.

Mr. President, what I have said is predicated upon the proposition that there is and shall continue to exist a need for the manned bomber in our aerial arsenal. This is the subject of continuing debate, but I would submit that the militaristic forces in the world today have required us to develop an armed force with the greatest possible flexibility. We have seen once again the need for conventional troops and conventional weapons. And, this is so, so that we may have the greatest number of options to face the multitude of military actions we may be required to face—whether it be guerrilla warfare, police action, conventional warfare, or nuclear devastation.

This same principle, it seems to me, should equally apply to the development of our aerial weapons systems. The course of the Pentagon today with the

July 1, 1965

14909

mittee, this country possesses a political philosopher and foreign affairs analyst unexcelled among those who have held political office in the modern history of our Republic. Senator FULBRIGHT again demonstrated his highly developed intellectual qualities in a speech he delivered to the Rhodes Scholar Reunion, at Swarthmore, College on June 19. Senator FULBRIGHT had some stark, but accurate thoughts about the contemporary world situation:

In recent months events have taken an ominous turn. For varied and complex reasons the nations are sliding back into the self-righteous and crusading spirit of the cold war.

It is clear in any case that the cold war detente is at best in suspension. The crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are affecting matters far beyond the frontiers of the countries concerned.

Somewhat like the great powers of 1914, the Soviet Union and the United States appear to have lost much of their former control of events; like the great powers of 1914 they appear to be more preoccupied with commitments to others than with their own interests and preferences in relations with each other.

Under these conditions the prognosis for peace with freedom is hardly favorable.

But Senator FULBRIGHT is not wholly pessimistic about our chances to preserve the peace. In his concluding lines, he noted:

But existing conditions are not permanent conditions, and prevailing tendencies are not irreversible. Our capacity to shape events is as great as our capacity to understand them. The national and constructive conduct of public affairs is not man's most conspicuous talent, to be sure; but it has been done before, and it can be done again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator FULBRIGHT's thoughtful address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM

(By Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT)

As an objective of foreign policy "peace with freedom" is a dubious concept. The difficulty about peace is that practically everybody wants it but practically everybody wants something else more. The difficulty about freedom is that the form of it most desired in the world is the freedom to work one's will upon others. And the difficulty about any noble objective in human affairs is that there are likely to be as many versions of it—usually conflicting versions—as there are advocates.

I do not suggest that "peace with freedom" is an unworthy object of our foreign policy but only that the pursuit of it with too much zeal is the surest way to lose it. Of all the faculties of man none is more perfectly developed than the talent for cutting general principles to the specifications of personal interest and ambition. We Americans sincerely believe that our policies are designed to secure peace with freedom for all men. But the Russians and the Chinese may be just as sincere in believing that their policies are the way to peace with freedom. Under these conditions the prospects for peace with freedom in the world would seem to depend on the restraint with which everybody pursues his own particular concept of it.

Of all the dangers that beset humanity perhaps the greatest is man's abiding dis-

satisfaction with his own nature. Through the ages men have constantly tried and constantly succeeded in efforts to control their natural environment. Just as constantly men have tried and failed to alter their own nature. For reasons not easily understood we have never been at peace with our human appetites and instincts and irrationalities and have striven, at a disastrous price in violence and self-hate, to make ourselves into a race of angels. The product of all this striving to be better than we are or can be is that self-deceiving righteousness which enables men in pristine conscience to commit unspeakable acts of cruelty.

I believe that the world has suffered far less from overt wickedness than from too much passion for virtue and too much conviction about how to achieve it. These sentiments, rooted in man's hatred of his own human nature, lead not to virtue but to the macabre entreaty of Mark Twain's "War Prayer": "For our sakes who adore Thee, Lord," the mysterious stranger prays before battle, "blast their hopes, blight their lives, protract their bitter pilgrimage, make heavy their steps, water their way with their tears, stain the white snow with the blood of their wounded feet. We ask it, in the spirit of love, of Him who is the source of love, and who is the ever-faithful refuge and friend of all that are sore beset and seek His aid with humble and contrite hearts. Amen."

I think that the prospects for peace with freedom would be much improved if we could come to terms with our imperfections and modify our ambitions. "Human nature will not change," said Abraham Lincoln. "In any future great national trial, compared with the men of this, we shall have as weak and as strong, as silly and as wise, as bad and as good."¹ If only we could learn to live with this prospect and could make our peace with the imperfections of human nature, we might then be able to develop the respect for ourselves and the compassion for others which are the conditions of peace with freedom.

The world is not at present moving in this direction. Until a short time ago it seemed that it might be, but in recent months events have taken an ominous turn. For varied and complex reasons the nations are sliding back into the self-righteous and crusading spirit of the cold war. We are hearing very much more these days about honor and principles and peace and freedom and national liberation and it is all being accompanied by rising tensions and violence. It is too soon to say whether the trend toward more stable world relations which seemed to be developing a short time ago is merely being interrupted or whether a whole new tendency is taking hold in world politics.

It is clear in any case that the cold war detente is at best in suspension. The crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are affecting matters far beyond the frontiers of the countries concerned. The Alliance for Progress, for example, was regarded as progressing hopefully until April of this year, but its future is now uncertain. The steady improvement of our relations with the neutralist countries and with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe has been interrupted by the spreading belief that the United States is no longer in sympathy with the nationalism of small and struggling nations.

Most important and ominous of all, events in southeast Asia and in the Caribbean are greatly complicating relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Their detente has not been destroyed but it is in abeyance and a renewed atmosphere of harshness is developing. Neither of the great powers appears to welcome this deterioration in relations and neither has deliberately brought it about, but, powerful

though they are, they seem powerless to arrest it. Somewhat like the great powers of 1914, the Soviet Union and the United States appear to have lost much of their former control of events; like the great powers of 1914, they appear to be more preoccupied with commitments to others than with their own interests and preferences in relations with each other.

Under these conditions the prognosis for peace with freedom is hardly favorable. But existing conditions are not permanent conditions and prevailing tendencies are not irreversible. Our capacity to shape events is as great as our capacity to understand them. The rational and constructive conduct of public affairs is not man's most conspicuous talent, to be sure, but it has been done before and it can be done again.

I have no prescription to offer as to how to improve the prospects for peace and freedom in the world beyond the general proposition that they are most successfully pursued when they are pursued without excess of zeal. "All this struggling and striving to make the world better is a great mistake," wrote Shaw: "not because it isn't a good thing to improve the world if you know how to do it, but because striving and struggling is the worst way you could set about doing anything."²

The prospects for peace with freedom depend very largely on the ability of nations to recognize that "peace with freedom" means different things to different people and that, however deeply one may believe in one's own version of it, it is just possible that someone else's version is as good or even better. Without taking the words quite literally, I think there is wisdom—at least as a corrective to prevailing views—in Alexander Pope's lines on government:

"For forms of government let fools contest;
Whate'er is best administer'd is best;
For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.
In faith and hope the world will disagree,
But all mankind's concern is charity."³

VIETNAM DIALOG: MR. BUNDY AND THE PROFESSORS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on June 21, between 10 and 11 p.m., what I consider to be the most important program of the television year was presented by CBS. I am referring, of course, to the special report entitled "Vietnam Dialog: Mr. Bundy and the Professors."

This program was a pleasant contrast to the unruly, disorganized, and one-sided all-day "teach-in" which was televised on May 15.

It was conducted as a debate on Vietnam should be; it was moderated by Eric Sevareid, one of the best news analysts in the country; and the proponents and the opponents of the President's policy on Vietnam each had the same fair chance to state and to defend their point of view.

The program was a clear victory for the proponents. The long-awaited appearance of McGeorge Bundy, who was ably assisted by Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski and Dr. Guy Pauker, was a solid success for him and for the administration.

I think most people will agree with this evaluation.

But more important than who won or who lost is the fact that the American public finally had a chance to view and listen to a balanced, reasonable debate

¹ "Response to a Serenade," Nov. 10, 1864.

² "Cashel Byron's Profession" (1886), ch. 6.
³ "Essay on Man," Epistle III, line 303.

July 1, 1965

on what is the single most important and most difficult foreign policy problem the United States faces at the present time.

For this public service, I commend CBS, Eric Sevareid, and the six participants in "Vietnam Dialog."

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] placed into the Record, yesterday, the transcript of the program. That gave me a chance to read through the debate a second time; and I hope Senators and other people will also avail themselves of this opportunity to review that excellent exchange of ideas and views.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senate Rules Committee report which has just been released points up some of the many conflicts of interest in which Mr. Bobby Baker was involved while serving as an employee of the U.S. Senate, and the committee in effect recommends his indictment.

I commend them on this phase of their report and support their conclusions; however, I regret that the committee did not see fit to explore further some of the other obvious angles involving Mr. Baker and perhaps other employees.

For example:

Only one aspect of the so-called freight forwarders case was explored by the committee. Even the majority members of the committee recognized this case as unfinished business when in their report they said:

The committee is aware of the fact that the Department of Justice has accumulated a considerable amount of information on other aspects of this subject matter.

An investigation involving solicitations from and the handling by the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. of certain political contributions was conspicuously sidestepped.

Failure to call the numerous witnesses requested by the minority members leaves a serious question in the minds of many as to what would or could have been developed.

As is pointed out in the minority views, it is obvious to all who have examined Mr. Baker's activities that until such time as national defense contractors, such as North American Aviation and Northrop, decide they no longer want or need to do business with Mr. Baker his complex financial empire may continue to prosper. Why was not a more thorough examination made to ascertain why these major defense contractors felt it advantageous to discontinue their contractual arrangements with the vending companies who had been providing their services and give their business to Mr. Baker's newly organized Serv-U Corp.? Who helped Mr. Baker get his confidential security clearance through the Defense Department so expeditiously to make it possible for his company to establish eligibility for access in these defense plants?

What services was Mr. Baker rendering to the Murchison interests that would cause one of their top officials to cut Mr. Baker in on exceptionally profitable speculations without Mr. Baker's having to put up any capital or share any risk?

From what source did Mr. Baker obtain the approximately \$100,000 in cash that he had so conveniently stashed away in his file cabinet?

These are but a few of the many unanswered questions concerning the operations of this former employee of the U.S. Senate who, while drawing a \$19,000 Government salary, was, in the brief span of less than 5 years, able to pyramid his net worth from around \$80,000 to approximately \$2¼ million while at the same time reporting a comparatively negligible tax liability.

In its report the committee makes several recommendations toward the establishment of new rules in the Senate and the enactment of new legislation, the purpose of which will be to prevent a recurrence of such an episode.

I support these recommendations to the extent that they go; however, as is pointed out by some members of both the majority and the minority in the supplemental views, I question that the committee's recommendations go far enough. Later, when these proposals come before the Senate, I shall outline in greater detail my own views as to what further steps are necessary.

As I stated when this investigation first started in 1963, the Senate itself is on trial, and under no circumstances can this investigation be allowed to stop short of a full disclosure and adequate steps being taken to safeguard against such an episode ever happening again.

EDUCATION AND ITS RELATION TO THE COST OF ELECTRICITY IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial about education and its relation to the cost of electricity in the State of California. The editorial was published in the June 4, 1965, issue of the Oceanside, Calif., Blade-Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A MATTER OF PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

The board of regents of the University of California is faced with another controversial decision. At the end of last year, the university's contract with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for electric power supplied the Berkeley campus expired. The regents must now either renew this agreement or make plans to switch to electricity purchased from the Central Valley project of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

At stake is the sum of \$21,817,000. This amount could be saved the Berkeley administration over the next 10 years by a Central Valley project contract, according to estimates prepared by the university's vice president for business affairs.

Looking into the future there will be, within the State of California, an ample supply of Federal power. Congress intended, via the reclamation statutes, that this low cost energy should go first to public or "preference" agencies. Unfortunately, there is sometimes a difficulty in getting the power from the point of generation or from a Federal transmission net, such as the Central Valley project, to the site of demand. The CVP substation closest to Berkeley is located at Tracy, 50 miles to the east.

In the present instance, Pacific Gas &

Electric has flatly refused to transfer the Federal power over PG & E lines from Tracy to Berkeley. However, the University of California campus at Davis has already converted from private to public power brought to the campus via PG & E lines. How the private utility can refuse to carry energy to Berkeley when it is already wheeling power to Davis is not clear.

Perhaps the answer can be found in the savings public power makes possible at Davis. In February 1965, the Davis campus paid the Government 4.932 mills per kilowatt-hour for its electricity. Had the university continued with PG & E service, the cost would have been 9.954 mills per kilowatt-hour. Thus the cost of electricity at Davis has been more than cut in two. These figures have been given the Blade-Tribune by F. K. Crouch, the university's engineer for planning and construction.

The power report to the regents has indicated that substantial savings could be put into effect if the university built its own lines between Tracy and Berkeley to carry Government power to the campus. This reduction would be smaller than would be possible with PG & E carrying the load on its existing lines. But the capital investment required could be quickly amortized and thereafter electricity costs at Berkeley would be cut by \$1,356,000 per year.

The board of regents is now contemplating the institution of a \$50 per term tuition fee for students. The optimum power saving to be made possible by the change to public sources would aggregate more than \$100 per year for every undergraduate at Berkeley. The Blade-Tribune urges the regents to look carefully and hopefully into the recommendations made by its own administration report.

APPEASEMENT OF NASSER

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is shocking and disappointing that, despite the overwhelming expression of sentiment in Congress, on more than one occasion, the administration still continues to appease Nasser, whose every action has been hostile to all the purposes which the United States seeks in the Middle East, who has been guilty of aggression and threatened aggression over and over again, and who is the greatest menace to the peace and progress of the Middle East.

An appropriate comment is found in an article entitled: "The Tie That Binds," written by Henry J. Taylor, and published in the June 30 issue of the Washington Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 30, 1965]

THE TIE THAT BINDS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

When President Johnson lifted the suspension on aid to Nasser he did exactly what a Senate majority had intended to prevent.

The outraged Members tried to stop the golden flow after Nasser's thugs burned our Cairo libraries and heaped contempt—again—on American aid. A wiser U.S. policy was as much at stake as the money.

Yet, behind the scenes, Mr. Johnson engineered the defeat of the aid ban in the Senate. He repeated the same old, tired contention that is promoted whenever common-sense catches up with our foreign aid—

In addition, numerous State legislatures have petitioned Congress to call a constitutional convention—a procedure provided for in the Constitution but never yet employed—to consider an amendment on the reapportionment issue.

However, the political climate has become increasingly hostile to any change in the Supreme Court's decision. The 1964 elections resulted in liberal democratic majorities in most of the State legislatures as well as Congress. The liberal Democrats, with their main power base in the cities, may be counted on to oppose any dilution of the Court rulings.

Moreover, since courts have already forced more and more of the State legislatures to move onto a straight population basis, the new State legislatures, elected under the new plans, are unlikely to approve a constitutional amendment which would bring back the old order. A congressional quarterly survey showed that just in the interval between the 1964 Supreme Court decisions and the end of last year, new apportionment lawsuits were filed or actual reapportionment bills were passed in 33 States.

At the start of 1965, 24 of the 50 States were under Court orders to reapportion before the next legislative elections. If you live in one of these States, you can count on your State being forced to approve new districts in 1965 or 1966: Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming.

In addition, early reapportionment action is also anticipated in Alaska, Arkansas, Georgia, Missouri, New Mexico, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and South Dakota.

Yet regardless of how irreversible opponents may find the trend, reapportionment is not as simple as it may seem, and the Court has not yet overcome Justice Frankfurter's warning that it deals with a "political thicket" and a "mathematical quagmire." While Washington Attorney Charles S. Rhyne, who argued the Baker case, has lauded the decisions as "a correct application of the great principles which have made our Nation and its system of government the greatest on earth," others see dire consequences and years of litigation ahead.

"The effect of these decisions should be obvious to even the most elementary student of history," says Representative WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, of Ohio. "The whole structure of our form of government shall be transformed and the unique system of checks and balances undermined. There shall be substituted the dominance of mass rule." Critics like McCULLOCH fear that big city political bosses will be in a position to control entire State governments.

Even political analysts who are standing out of the line of fire see a host of new and difficult problems yet to arise.

For one thing, a careful study of representative government suggests that mere mathematical equality in the sizes of districts is no guarantee that a legislature represents a majority of the people.

Actually, all that it really takes to control a legislature is 51 percent of the vote in 51 percent of the districts. Thus, only 26 percent of the people could technically control a legislature—even with perfectly equal populated districts.

Thus, if a ruling party or group is clever enough, it can so arrange the districts that it is permanently locked into control. One of the tools most frequently used is the "gerrymander"—a legislative district weirdly shaped to embrace a voting majority for one party. But even without obvious gerrymandering, ruling cliques can maximize their strength far beyond their actual numbers.

The Supreme Court will some day have to decide whether the complex reapportionment schemes of many States are in fact devices to deny the constitutional rights the Court seeks to protect.

Another problem is the multimember district, often used to include an entire metropolitan area. This device shows that politics is not simply a matter of country versus city. If a city entitled to 15 representatives runs them all at large from 1 big district, instead of carving the city up into 15 districts, the majority population of the entire city can elect all 15 representatives. Then major areas within the city, or substantial minority groups within it, can be deprived of any effective representation at all, even under the one man, one vote rule.

Another factor is the very complexity of representation. Whether carefully or casually drawn, legislative districts can either over- or under-represent important racial, religious, ethnic and economic groups. Inevitably, the groups which feel they have been mistreated are going to be appealing more and more for redress through the courts—and since the Baker case the courts are open to them.

Thus the current round of apportionment cases, all centered on relatively simple arguments about unequal populations, may simply be the prelude to years of extended litigation in which the courts will need the wisdom of Solomon to decide what really adds up to "equal protection of the laws."

[From Newsweek, June 14, 1965]

PERSPECTIVE: BACK TO BOSSISM

(By Raymond Moley)

The powerful dissenting argument of Justice Frankfurter in the first of the reapportionment cases, his last and best opinion, seems to have left a majority of his colleagues unimpressed. For since then, the Court has moved far beyond its original position, holding that both houses of State legislatures must be apportioned on the basis of what is somewhat loosely called "one man, one vote." Wide criticism and the opposition in Congress to this judicial intervention in a political question have not deterred the Court, liberal Democrats and union labor from pressing on for a full application of this representational revolution throughout the Nation.

Perhaps the effort to stem the tide relies too heavily upon tradition. For it is impossible to escape the conclusion that in the torrent of reform which has been sweeping the country since the election in 1964, tradition has been rejected as reactionary, and benighted. I shall therefore refrain from an appeal to history. The Supreme Court is determined not only to interpret the law, but to create an institutional revolution.

BALANCE IS NEEDED

The effect of the sort of representation now decreed by the Court and apparently supported by the proadministration majority in Congress will, if successful, subject the legislatures of every big industrial State to control by the major cities. This will be most marked in such States as Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York and Massachusetts.

Because of the drift of population, great urban masses have a preponderance of the voting strength in their States. If we are to believe that pure democracy is the way to enlightenment, justice and progress, it follows that we shall want these great masses of voters to dominate the legislative bodies of the States, to work their will and promote their interests without check or restraint. The suggestion of the necessity of countervailing forces to assure deliberation of debate and legislative calm these days may be excoriated by the gentle knights of change. But sober reflections on the mo-

tives and habits of people in the mass must tell us of the need for balance.

When power is given without limitation to people in the mass, they do not make their decisions by individual and rational choice. They move as a unit, dominated by their social and economic environment—and their leaders. The rule is, as the late Prof. V. O. Key pointed out after a monumental study of polling, that mass opinion represents an "interaction" between what he called "influentials" and the bulk of the people. The people, he said, are moved by their leaders' "cues" and "proposals." Those leaders are the "activists." Thus, what we call the "democratic order" depends upon the beliefs, standards and interests of its leaders.

DOMINATE STATE CAPITALS

In the industrial centers the leaders are the political bosses and the labor leaders. The masses are told how to vote, not directly and arbitrarily in all cases, but by clever devices, deluding the minds and emotions of the voters. In short, a great majority in every urban area is controlled.

For more than a century these urban areas were boss controlled. Some still are. But as Federal welfare grew after the middle 1930's, the bosses became mere proconsuls under the Federal establishment which had unlimited funds to supplant the machine's beneficial treasury. This, it seemed, meant the twilight of the boss and the machine. Like Othello, they found their "occupation gone."

Reapportionment, which will throw control of the legislatures to these city machines and unions, will mark a revival of the old order. For in many States the urban organizations, mostly Democratic, will dominate the State capitals. Through control of the legislatures, the urban legislative stooges will next redraw the congressional districts and thus assure in the House of Representatives a majority capable of perpetuating what we have now.

That is the prospect before us. And unless some constitutional means is devised and enacted to assure some semblance of geographical representation in at least one house of the State legislatures, there may well be indeterminate domination of national affairs by the political and labor leaders in the great cities.

FE — *Clark* THE VIETNAMESE SITUATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is heartening to me to see that the congressional debate on Vietnam is continuing in a spirited manner. There can be no limitation of discussion on so critical a subject as this without impinging upon the necessary political rights of Americans as members of a democratic, pluralistic society.

Last week, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] made an extremely able analysis of the situation in Vietnam. Time made it impossible for me to indicate the extent to which I agree with his view. Accordingly, I wish to say a word or two about the subject now.

I also note, although I did not have the privilege of hearing his address, that the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] reverted again to the Vietnamese situation and made a number of specific suggestions for ways of settling that controversy. Without committing myself to supporting the views of the senior Senator from Oregon, I point out that at the United Nations 20th anniversary celebration in San Francisco, which I had the pleasure of attending last week, the President of the United States invited the members of the United Nations,

14934

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1, 1965

individually and collectively, to interest themselves in the situation in Vietnam.

The President called on all members of the United Nations, and, in particular, on the Secretary General, Mr. U Thant, to use their good offices to bring the aggressors to the conference table so that the shooting and the bombing can stop and some peaceful way can be found to neutralize Vietnam, so that it need no longer be a cat's paw between two great powers, China and the United States of America.

I am delighted that the President made that speech. I am delighted that he called the attention of the United Nations to the Vietnamese situation. Yet, we must note very carefully a definite limitation on the possibilities for any successful United Nations intervention in Vietnam. In the first place, Russia is undergoing what I suppose the late John Foster Dulles would refer to as an "agonizing reappraisal" of its position in the Far East.

Russia is a permanent member of the Security Council, and, as such, it has the right to veto any proposals we or any other member of the Security Council may make with respect to Vietnam. I doubt very much whether at the present time any constructive result could be obtained by bringing the Vietnamese situation before the Security Council.

Almost inevitably, it would put the United States into direct opposition to Russia. Our friends would take sides with us. The members of the Communist block would side with Russia. Unless we are able by diplomatic contacts to work out some basis for settlement in Vietnam, I do not believe that the United Nations, acting through the Security Council, would be helpful.

Let us turn then to the General Assembly, in which there is one vote, and only one vote, for every nation in the world which is a member of the United Nations. It would be wishful thinking to hope for a constructive solution of so complicated a matter as the controversy in Vietnam to emerge from this body.

Moreover, by reason of the controversy over article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly presently is so immobilized that it cannot even take a vote. Until the article 19 controversy is resolved, the General Assembly, in my judgment, can be of little assistance in helping to resolve in the Vietnamese situation.

Therefore, I believe that the President acted very wisely indeed in suggesting in general rather than in specific terms that the members of the United Nations individually and collectively interest themselves in the Vietnamese situation.

He was wise indeed in not directing the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Vietnamese matter before either the Security Council or the General Assembly.

However, there remains one area in which the United Nations might well be of substantial assistance. That is through the good offices of the extremely wise and capable Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, the distinguished Burmese statesman. One

may hope that through his manifold connections with the statesmen, diplomats, and politicians of the nations of the world, both Communist and free, Mr. U Thant would be able to formulate a meaningful proposal under which we could meet the aggressors at the conference table and begin to work out a just and honorable settlement of the Vietnamese situation. I hope very much that that will be done.

After I left the 20th anniversary celebration of the United Nations in San Francisco, I went to White Sulphur Springs, Va., where Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, the able former Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, made an intensely stimulating and interesting address on the subject of China and the world.

It was my privilege to introduce Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker at that meeting. The occasion was the annual convention of the corporate secretaries of the largest corporations in the United States, a group which one would think would tend to take a conservative position on issues of foreign policy. Yet, during the question period which followed Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker's address, individual after individual arose to indicate agreement with the general position which he took in his speech.

That general position was that a way must be found to avoid following policies which have the effect of throwing a reluctant Russia into the arms of a smiling and triumphant China.

It was his view that in the Vietnamese situation we should be prepared to engage in discussions with anyone, and that this should include representatives of the Vietcong.

Mr. President, it is difficult for me to see, when we are engaged in fighting a bitter and bloody war which we want to settle, how we will be able to settle it without talking with the people who are fighting, shooting, and killing our soldiers. To me, the rather strange position which is being taken by the State Department in this regard is quite untenable. Relying on the already discredited White Paper, relying on intelligence sources which, to my way of thinking, are highly suspect, the State Department takes the firm position that it will negotiate only with Hanoi and that really there is no civil war going on in South Vietnam.

Even those of us who follow the war from Washington and who must depend for information on briefings from individuals charged with the responsibility of carrying out our policies there, are by now well convinced that while Hanoi and the North Vietnamese are granting substantial assistance in terms of material and equipment to the Vietcong, while replacements from Vietnam have filled the ranks of the Vietcong that have been decimated by the war, while it may be that regular army units of the North Vietnamese Army are presently, during the monsoon season, engaged in fighting side by side with the Vietcong against the South Vietnamese and the Americans, there is not a shadow of a doubt that there is massive opposition to the Saigon government in South Vietnam

from South Vietnamese, many of whom are not Communists at all, but who have merely allied themselves with the Vietcong.

Mr. President, this is a dirty war. It is a horrible war. Outrages which affront civilized man have been committed time after time by the Vietcong. I regret to say that similar atrocities have been perpetrated by our allies, the South Vietnamese.

The desire of all civilized and humane men and women all over the world is to stop the carnage and atrocities, and to bring peace to that troubled area, which scarcely deserves to be called a nation.

I would hope that Secretary Rusk would press ahead boldly with the suggestion, made the other day, that we are ready to talk to anybody Hanoi wishes to bring to the conference table, so as to make it possible to begin negotiations for ending the carnage.

We should realize, further, that within the complex and complicated political structure of Vietnam, there are, inevitably, a great many people who are fighting against the Vietcong, or perhaps participating in the government of South Vietnam, who have friends or even relatives among the Vietcong. Assuredly there are individuals in the Vietcong who have friends, and possibly relatives, among those who support the Saigon government. What harm would there be if the Ky government were to begin discussions, on its own, through those who may have friends or relatives in the Vietcong, in an effort to determine whether the Vietnamese cannot settle this bloody war themselves? Why need the great powers be the only ones attempting to bring peace? Why should we look for a signal from Peiping? Why should we look for a signal from Moscow? Why, indeed, should we look for a signal from Hanoi? Why should it not be an important part of our diplomacy to encourage negotiations between the two Vietnamese groups which are now fighting each other?

It occurs to me that if this suggestion were carried out, we might find it possible to avoid a confrontation between Russia and Red China and the United States, which if it results in a direct military clash might well escalate into a nuclear World War III.

So I would hope our diplomats would try to take over from our military men, so that, through the normal channels of diplomacy in Saigon, we would be able to encourage the South Vietnamese to talk with representatives of the Vietcong.

After all, it is their country. It is their war. We are there by their invitation. They are the people who are primarily responsible for settling it.

While we are doing this, I hope there will be no further escalation of the bombing. It has had nothing but harmful effects for our interests. We must avoid the possibility of confrontation with Russia and Russian missiles near Hanoi.

Having said this, I am keenly aware that hopes for a prompt settlement in Vietnam are not bright. I agree with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Fulbright]. I agree with the President when he says that

July 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14935

we cannot scuttle and run. My opinion is that we are going to have to fight it out until after the monsoon season, in order to persuade Peiping and Hanoi that we are not going to scuttle and run. But like many other Americans, I am of the strong view that the emphasis must be on stopping the war as quickly as it can be stopped. I hope the suggestion I have made this afternoon might have some bearing on the end result.

CRITICAL ISSUES IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, turning briefly to a third and final subject, to my way of thinking there are three immediate controversial and critical issues in the international field which confront the United States of America right now and for which we are going to have to find answers in the immediate future.

When I speak of three issues, I am excluding Vietnam, which, of course, is a critical one—I have just spoken on it—and I am excluding the Dominican Republic, where we are far from arriving at a solution.

With respect to every one of these three issues, we in the Congress and in the country at large, are in my judgment unable to come to a sensible, well-considered consensus on policy because of excessive executive secrecy.

The first issue has to do with a proposed treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons which the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], with the support of 17 colleagues, including myself and the Senator from Maryland, whom I see on the floor, urged so eloquently a few days ago. I said during the course of that discussion that we are never going to get a nonproliferation treaty with Russia, and we are kidding ourselves if we think we will, unless we abandon the utterly obsolete concept of a NATO multilateral nuclear force, or even an Atlantic nuclear force, conceived for the purpose of keeping West Germany happy by giving her a finger on the nuclear trigger.

I repeat today that we must get rid of the multilateral nuclear force concept in order to get to the conference table to work out an agreement with Russia and the other members of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva.

In the New York Times of this morning there is a story which indicates that the top-secret Gilpatric report takes exactly the same position I took on the floor of the Senate last week at the time of the speech of the Senator from New York. We do not know what is in that report. We have every right to know. That report should have been made available to the Armed Services Committees of both Houses, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. It should have been made available months ago. I do not believe these reports should be kept in secrecy. In my opinion, they should be made available. In the pluralistic democracy in which we live free speech and public discussion upon issues brought before the people are

essential. It seems to me that our policies on such issues should be hammered out on the anvil of free discussion.

What excuse can the State Department have for not giving us this report? Is it being withheld merely because it is critical of the outmoded and harmful concept of MLF? I note that Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, former Foreign Minister of Great Britain, in his speech at White Sulphur Springs and in conversations he has had since he came to Washington, has likewise urged the desirability of a treaty for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

In the second place, to my way of thinking, we need to face up to the vexing problem of article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations. It is well known that we are in direct confrontation with both France and Russia regarding the assessment of dues for certain peace-keeping activities of the United Nations.

This dispute will have to be resolved not later than early September, or the General Assembly of the United Nations will again be immobilized, will again be prevented from taking any votes, and will again be prevented from acting in any way except by unanimous consent, as has been the case during all of 1965 to date.

I regret very much that our Government was not prepared at the commemorative session of the United Nations in San Francisco last week to give some indication to the other nations of the world gathered there for that historic event, as to what we propose to do about article XIX.

I believe that the need for debate on this subject on the floor of the Senate is no less urgent than the need for continued debate on Vietnam. I believe that the House of Representatives should likewise join in. I hope we can get some guidance from the executive branch as to what we intend to do on that vexing question, which must be answered not much more than 60 days from now.

I shall have something more extensive to say on the subject later this month.

Finally, Mr. President, there is a cloud not much bigger than one's hand growing on the horizon, but it is growing fast. The source of that cloud is this question: What are we going to do about maintaining an adequate liquidity of internal monetary resources to finance world trade?

The cloud becomes bigger every day, as we achieve new successes in bringing our balance of payments into surplus. For the months of March, April, and May, our balance of payments was in surplus. I am one who is convinced that we must keep our balance of payments at least in equilibrium and preferably in surplus. But with each successful effort—and may they continue—we will also succeed in decreasing the liquidity necessary to finance growing world trade.

Yet, we in Congress are unable to get the facts. The people are not being given the basic facts about the critical discussions now going forward on proposals to increase the capacity of the International Monetary Fund to deal with this vexing problem.

We are unable to know whether the Treasury Department is seriously thinking—as I am confident it should be—of converting the International Monetary Fund into something not much different from our own Federal Reserve Board.

We are unable to know what is in the Ossola report.

All we know is that it is a report which was made to the chief central banks of the world by a distinguished Italian monetary expert, at their request. It has been in the Treasury Department for months. It has been in the central banks of all the great industrial nations of the world for months.

But, can we get it in the Congress? No.

Can we have intelligent discussion as to what to do in this regard, if the bureaucracy is going to classify as top secret, information which is necessary to make a judgment of some wisdom in connection with it? No.

I close, Mr. President, with a plea to the executive branch to disavow this executive secrecy, to overcome this phobia which usually starts low down in the bureaucracy, and stems from an inherent timidity.

Let us give the people the facts.

Let us bring out the Gilpatric report.

Let us bring out the Ossola report.

Let us give the country some guidance as to what we are going to do about article 19.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

REAPPORTIONMENT: THE BALANCE OF POWERS SHIFTS TO THE SUBURBS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on two previous occasions I have risen to discuss the "rotten borough amendments." These proposed amendments to the Constitution, sponsored by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and others, would permit one house of a State legislature to be apportioned on the basis of factors other than population. On June 2, in my first major speech on this floor, I tried to cover as comprehensively as I could the major difficulties with the pending amendments. On June 21, I discussed the implications of the proposed amendments with respect to civil rights. Today I should like to discuss the effects of reapportionment upon the cities, the suburbs, and the rural areas.

Proponents of the "rotten borough amendments" often contend that a fairly apportioned legislature would be dominated by a cohesive bloc of urban legislators controlled by a powerful political machine. They claim that minority interests outside the metropolitan areas will be ignored and their needs submerged to the demands of city dwellers. Such fears are not justified either by fact or by experience.

It is simply not true that cities would dominate fairly apportioned State legislatures. There is no State in which the residents of a single city could elect a

14936

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1, 1965

majority of the legislature. Even New York City contains only 46.4 percent of the people of New York State; Chicago has 35.2 percent, Baltimore has 30.3 percent, Minneapolis-St. Paul has 23.3 percent, and Detroit has 21.3 percent. No other major city contains more than 20 percent of the State's population.

Moreover, there are only five States in which the combined population of the three largest cities constitutes more than 40 percent of the population of the State.

In only two of these States, New York and Arizona, is it theoretically possible for the residents of the central cities to join together to elect a majority of the representatives to the legislature. In Arizona an alliance between Phoenix and Tucson would be needed to produce this majority and in New York a majority could be produced only by an alliance of two or more upstate cities with New York City.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that it frequently happens that when there are two or more major cities in a State, they often fight each other in the legislature tooth and nail. Examples are Fort Worth and Dallas, upstate cities in New York versus New York City, Kansas City and St. Louis, and Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Equally significant is the fact that for 30 years our major cities have been losing population as compared to the rest of the State. In 1930, New York City contained 55.1 percent of the State's population. In 1960, it contained only 46.4 percent. Chicago declined from 44.2 to 35.2, Detroit from 32.4 to 21.3 percent. Indeed, from 1950 to 1960 15 of this country's 23 largest cities suffered an actual loss in total population and only 5 of the 23 were able to grow as rapidly as the statewide average.

The major increase in population has been and will continue to be in the suburbs. Of our 23 largest cities, only 3—Houston, Dallas, and Atlanta—grew faster than their suburbs in the years from 1950 to 1960. For example, New York City's population declined by 1.4 percent from 1950 to 1960 while its suburbs witnessed a 75-percent increase. Los Angeles-Long Beach grew by 27.1 percent but their suburbs increased by 82.6 percent. Chicago's population dropped by 1.9 percent while its suburbs grew by 71.5 percent. The National Municipal League estimates that by 1980 New York, Dallas, and Houston will be the only major cities containing more population than their surrounding suburbs.

It is perfectly clear that reapportionment based solely on population will have its greatest effect in increasing suburban representation. The result will be that in any clash between the cities and the rural areas the suburbs would hold the balance of power.

It is frequently assumed that representatives from the cities and the suburbs will be constant allies in the legislature. Certainly suburbanites share common problems with city dwellers. However, the suburbs are made up of people who have fled the crowded cities in their desire for lawns and trees and who thus hold different aspirations than their former neighbors. There is constant

tension between city and suburb over such fundamental matters as taxation (for example, the earnings tax dispute), highway location, rapid transit, annexation, sewer and water interconnections and charges, and many other matters. Astute rural legislators have exploited and will continue to exploit these differences to obtain passage of legislation of peculiar interest to them.

Cooperation between the suburbs and the countryside can also be expected on account of party cohesion. Residents of both areas have frequently tended to vote Republican. It can be assumed that, rather than supporting the predominantly Democratic groups from the cities, suburban Republicans will often prefer the policies of their Republican brethren from the country.

Moreover, even in States where representatives from urban areas would constitute a large percentage of the legislature it cannot be assumed that they would vote as a bloc. Prof. David R. Durge has studied the urban-rural conflict in the Illinois legislature. After the 1955 reapportionment in the Illinois House the representatives from Cook County and Chicago had a numerical majority in the House. Nonetheless, Professor Durge found they did not vote as a bloc. In fact, in only 4 of the 332 rollcall votes was there a cohesion of more than 67 percent among the Chicago Cook County representatives. In other words, two-thirds of the urban oriented group of legislators managed to vote together only 1 percent of the time.

The reasons for the lack of cohesion among urban representatives are not difficult to understand. As Prof. Royce Hanson of American University has pointed out:

Urban and suburban citizens are not a homogeneous mass of humanity. An urban senator * * * must deal with bankers and laborers, segregationists and freedom workers, research biologists and the antivivisection society.

Professor Hanson concludes:

Majorities and minorities are more likely to rest on temporary coalitions of interests than on urban-rural cleavages.

The competing pressures on an urban representative make it unlikely that he and his colleagues can combine unfairly to disadvantage rural interests.

Experience demonstrates that urban legislators deal fairly with their rural brethren, perhaps more fairly than they have been dealt with. The highly respected Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has found, for example, that during the 1950's both houses of the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin were apportioned substantially on the basis of population. Over 50 percent of the population in each of these States was regarded as urban. Nonetheless each of these States allocated funds for education and highway purposes to local governments according to formulas that clearly benefited rural areas. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations concludes:

Thus, urban representatives appeared to recognize certain special needs of rural areas in the States with apportioned legislative

seats substantially in accordance with population.

Indeed there is reason to believe that in certain circumstances urban legislators may, in the long run, give rural citizens greater consideration than these citizens receive at the hands of their own legislators. One dramatic example of this is found in my own State where the shortsightedness of certain rural legislators with respect to the problems of pollution and development of the Chesapeake Bay has led to a serious deterioration in the shellfish industry. Ironically, the Maryland Legislature will have to be reapportioned in order that the urban and suburban legislators can exert influence in the development of the Chesapeake Bay, and thus save the rural-centered shellfish industry from steady depletion and erosion as a result of inaction by the representatives from the very area where the shellfish industry is located.

Another argument raised by the supporters of the "rotten borough amendment" is that large cities are often run by corrupt political machines which seek only to increase their own power at the expense of the citizens of the State. This argument contains more drama than truth as the editors of Fortune magazine have demonstrated in their book, "The Exploding Metropolis." It shows that American cities today are, on the whole, efficiently run by honest political leaders.

The fears conjured up by the image of the political machine are particularly unfounded when applied to the suburbs. The fact that suburbanites are generally well educated and comfortable makes them an inappropriate spawning ground for an all-powerful political machine. As the balance of political power will rest with the suburbs, there is thus no risk that it will be exercised at the dictates of a small and irresponsible group of big-city party leaders.

As the foregoing analysis has indicated, the often voiced fear of urban domination is wholly lacking in substance.

An act as serious as amending the Constitution should not be undertaken in the absence of a clear and urgent need. Such a need is not now evident and the increasing significance of suburbia strengthens the belief that this need is unlikely to arise in the future. I might add that this would be the first time that the Constitution of the United States would have been amended to limit the franchise since the founding of the Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record a booklet published by the National Municipal League, written by William J. D. Boyd, senior associate of the league, and entitled "Suburbia Takes Over."

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUBURBIA TAKES OVER

(By William J. D. Boyd)¹

The suburbs, and, in the long run, only the suburbs, will gain in the upheaval resulting from reapportionment of State legisla-

¹ Mr. Boyd is senior associate of the National Municipal League and for the last 3

July 1, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14965

Rural housing grants obligated, fiscal year
1964 through June 30—Continued

State	Initial number	Initial amount
South Dakota.....	5	\$4,040
Tennessee.....	79	62,430
Texas.....	149	118,670
Utah.....	6	5,810
Vermont.....	12	7,940
Virginia.....	8	7,690
Washington.....	1	1,000
West Virginia.....	275	257,500
Wisconsin.....	12	10,330
Wyoming.....	9	8,030
Puerto Rico.....	101	89,950
U.S. total.....	5,685	4,740,395
Average.....		834

CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to direct the attention of the Members to the complete inconsistency in the administration conduct of foreign affairs is defense of our and the world's freedom against the Communist forces.

American fighting men are committed to combat in Vietnam to save that country from communism. Our troops were rushed into the Dominican Republic to save that country from a Communist takeover. Although we are now tolerating Communist control of the so-called rebel movement in the Dominican Republic, the theoretical position of the administration continues to be that U.S. troops will remain on that island until stability through the formation of a non-Communist government can be developed.

U.S. troops are stationed in Europe as part of the NATO Alliance to protect Western Europe from possible Communist invasion. Our foreign aid program is partially justified on the ground that it is a weapon against the further spread of communism.

The question then arises, Mr. Speaker, is not subsidizing Communist governments through trade a position completely inconsistent with our actions in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and other areas I have cited.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that for more than a year the State Department has carried on secretive trade discussions with the Communist Governments of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself. The argument has been advanced by the administration that we can, through subsidized trade, "build bridges of understanding" to the governments of Eastern Europe and perhaps pull them away from Soviet control. We are also told that the Soviet Union has mellowed and by subsidizing trade with them, they might in some vague fashion give up their Communist belligerence.

Mr. Speaker, the position of the administration and the negotiations being carried on by the State Department are against the best long-term interests of the U.S. general public, our industries, our labor unions, and are against the best interests of world freedom.

Before subsidized trade is developed with any Communist government, we must work out specific conditions which would produce permanent major political and economic concessions from the Communists.

Trade is a key weapon in the cold war. It is the height of naivete to think that any Communist government has the best interest of its citizens in mind or is willing to enter into legitimate trade agreements with us. The purpose of the Communist governments seeking trade with the United States is to obtain the wherewithal to develop basic industries so that they can carry out an offensive trade against us in years to come.

What should we demand of the Communist governments before considering major trade agreements with them? Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points which I would recommend, all of which would be long overdue developments in the conduct of international relations.

Should the Soviet Union wish to be subsidized by trade agreements—such as they were in the Kennedy wheat sale 2 years ago—we should demand immediate settlement of their World War II lend-lease debt. It would be practical for us to insist that internationally supervised plebiscites be held in the Baltic States to serve the true wishes of the people there for self-determination before we subsidize the Red rulers in the Kremlin.

As the governments of the Eastern European satellites display interest in a trade agreement, we should insist that they grant their citizens freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion and that they hold free elections to prove whether or not they really have popular support of the public.

There are many other practical conditions that should be extracted from the Communist governments before we permit them to benefit by trading with the United States. We must keep in mind that trade with any Communist country helps all Communist countries, since it relieves the pressures on their domestic economies.

Perhaps one would question my continued reference to subsidized trade. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the intention of the administration merely to permit expanded trade agreements with Communist governments, but it is the specific intention to subsidize that trade. This would be a tragic development.

In recent months not only the Soviet Union but every Eastern European satellite, including Yugoslavia, has announced increased support of the Communist dictatorship in North Vietnam. Supplies from these Communist governments are pouring into North Vietnam, strengthening the determination and ability of the Reds to inflict direct losses on our troops in South Vietnam. Isn't it completely inconsistent then for the State Department to encourage U.S. firms to trade strategic materials to the Communists in return for basically nonessential goods and to add the greatest irony of all, that of subsidizing such transactions?

It is interesting to note that the propaganda drums of the administration are

beating out a steady tattoo to try to convince the public that dealing with Communist governments is a lucrative, wonderful operation and should be enthusiastically followed.

Yesterday the junior Senator from South Dakota, Mr. McGovern, chose to criticize former Vice President Nixon who had denounced the indiscriminate sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. This is in line with the administration's propaganda barrage that to subsidize Communist governments makes them mellow, or to paraphrase Secretary Rusk, a "fat Communist is not as dangerous as a lean Communist." Such nonsense is not surprising from an administration whose foreign policy is so completely misguided, but the danger cannot be minimized.

This morning we read of the Communist attack on our air base at Danang. The Vietcong attackers are motivated by the same ideology which motivates the Communist tyrants of the Eastern European satellites, the Soviet Union, and Red China. To rush to subsidize these governments merely perpetuates their autocratic control of their captive peoples, adds to the complications facing the United States abroad and delays the development of true peace and freedom.

A pet Johnsonian phrase is "building bridges of understanding with the Communists."

The Communists are intent on building a trade bridge which would save their foreign trade from economic ruin. Arming revolutionaries in Central and South America, Africa, and Asia has been exhausting; building up underdeveloped countries on orders from Moscow has also helped to wreck normal trade. The economic system has failed and so they turn to us to bail them out.

While a total boycott of Communist countries is impossible, trading could be kept within rational bounds. There is ever present, however, the danger that high pressure lobbies and Government optimists might give the Communists not only trade but long-term credit. England has already done so.

The Communists are in serious trouble. We can bail them out, enabling them to continue to fulfill their commitments to the Soviets. Or we can use this great opportunity to weaken further the position of communism and to strengthen the forces of freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

I have referred earlier to the concessions that we should demand prior to any trade agreement. Among the conditions which I would add are rehabilitation of political prisoners, freedom of movement, removal of the Berlin wall, and withdrawal of Soviet troops from non-Russian countries.

My main purpose in discussing this subject this afternoon, however, is to again remind the Members of the inconsistent, shortsighted, dangerous, and, I must even add diabolical plot of the Johnson administration to provide blood transfusions in the form of trade to Communist regimes which, because no strings whatsoever would be attached, permit these Communists to divert other resources to activities against us in Vietnam and Latin America.

CANADA'S NATIONAL HOLIDAY

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join our Canadian friends and neighbors in observance of their national holiday, July 1. Ninety-eight years ago, on July 1, 1867, Canada came into being as a new nation. It received its constitution, in the form of the British North America Act, 1867, and four of its large provinces—Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia—formed the confederation long known as the Dominion of Canada. Today the federated state of Canada consists of 10 provinces and 2 vast northern territories.

With one of these territories and with seven of these provinces the United States shares a common boundary; and with all of them it has close ties and contacts. In fact, in so many ways are the lives of our Canadian neighbors intertwined with ours that the two countries seem more like brothers than neighbors. Our mother country, England, had a more wayward son south of the boundary which was first established after the American Revolution; but many of the ties that existed then have continued to this day.

As in most families, there have been family quarrels and misunderstandings; but for the most part the relationship has been a particularly happy and helpful one. Like most brothers, the two countries have been mutually dependent upon one another, and in a variety of ways, despite their natural tendencies to go their separate ways and assert their independence. Conflicts of interest and flareups over failure to seek or see the other fellow's point of view are not to be taken lightly or passed over as temporary aberrations; but in the long run they point up the prevailing good relationship which is enhanced by definite steps to overcome difficulties. Witness the numerous bilateral bodies which have come into being through just such efforts.

In the fields of geography, defense, parliamentary affairs, social and cultural matters, and economics—with all its multiple angles—there are Canadian-American commissions and committees, both public and private, and various organizations which have been established for the primary purpose of promoting understanding and cooperation between Canada and the United States. They recognize the inescapable interweaving of the lives of our citizens. They realize that because of the fundamental interdependence of the two countries there are just that many more problems of coordination than there would be if it were possible for us to pursue our separate ways. Since it is not possible or desirable, the happy answer is cooperation of the genuine and widespread sort that grows and is nurtured on both sides of the border.

July the First in Canada, like July the Fourth in the United States, is a time to reassert our independence, but also to note our brotherhood.

Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out in my remarks, we recognize the inescapable

intertwining of the lives of our citizens. This is particularly true in my own State of Washington where we have common interests, common boundaries, and, yes, even common conflicts of interest with British Columbia and Alberta. At times we criticize each other, but the sincere respect we hold for one another always remains. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is an example which all nations of the world could follow. We are truly a showplace of nations living in peace.

FE *Land*
REPUBLICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan, our distinguished minority leader today issued a statement on the situation in Vietnam following a meeting of the joint Senate-House minority leadership. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement by Mr. Ford in the RECORD at this point.

The statement by Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN LEADER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON VIETNAM—JULY 1, 1965

Republicans will continue to disregard partisan considerations in foreign policy. We will be guided by the national interest.

Like Senator Arthur Vandenberg at the time of the Yalta agreement, we will criticize administration policy when it fails to serve the national interest. We will make constructive recommendations that will bolster the President's firmness. No Republican has called this McNamara's war.

Several House Republicans, including myself, recently made the following points about Vietnam:

1. The objectives of our Nation's policy must be the establishment of conditions under which the people of South Vietnam may live in peace and freedom. This means a government of their own choosing. This means freedom from aggression—from within and from without.

2. We hope for negotiations to end the fighting—to assure the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Let me clarify one point—the Communists are escalating the war. No American is. Moreover, Peking and Hanoi spurn the negotiating table.

3. The United States cannot, without violating its word, agree to settlement which involves a coalition government with Communists. Such government makes a larger war inevitable at a later date. History proves a coalition government with Communists gives them unlimited veto power. Veto power scuttles any hope for permanent peace.

4. The administration must not sacrifice the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. To do so makes the loss of American lives purposeless. Some Democrats would abandon the free people of South Vietnam. The President must not yield to them.

5. In this crisis, some Republican leaders believe American air and sea power must be used more effectively in North Vietnam against significant military targets. We advocate greater Allied participation. We question the logic of committing U.S. ground forces on a large scale to fight a war in southeast Asia.

FE *Chamb.*
VIETNAM SITUATION

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last night's Evening Star told us of another major battle in Vietnam. This morning's Post brought word of a brazen Vietcong attack on our air strip at Danang that hit at least six of our planes. So it goes, and you can expect more such stories with the regularity of your paper.

It is apparent that we have not been winning this war and that something more must be done. The question is what. We have been giving everything a try—even the use of our B-52 heavy bombers. Recently, while our Armed Services Subcommittee was in Saigon, it came to my attention that we might have yet another innovation that could be tried. I was surprised indeed to learn that there is no television communication in South Vietnam. Upon inquiry, I learned that it has been an issue of considerable debate. As a matter of fact, I am informed such recommendations were made many years ago. But nothing has been done.

At first, one might casually dismiss this with a bland "so what." But upon reflection, I am certain that it will be recognized that the suggestion is not without merit. Certainly in a struggle for the minds of men—and that is precisely what is going on today in Vietnam—we should be using every asset that is available to us. While our subcommittee was in Vietnam I made repeated inquiries, at all levels, about the desirability of establishing a television network and virtually everyone I discussed it with felt that it would be a most worthwhile undertaking. I checked further when we were in Thailand and learned that television facilities there were being effectively used to counter communistic efforts in that country.

So as I read the morning headlines, I thought I should mention this suggestion to my colleagues in the House and ask that you join me in seeking to evaluate the merits of this proposal. It is my understanding that studies have been made and I am making efforts to learn more fully about them. I have asked for a comprehensive report as soon as possible covering the background of the studies, the estimated cost, the arguments for and against creating such a television network, and the current status of the situation and any other data which would be helpful in reaching a decision as to the merits of such a program.

From conversations with our officials in South Vietnam, I am satisfied that the use of television would be of tremendous value to the war effort by simply establishing a means of communication with the people throughout the country and that such a network is feasible.

I am told that the cost of such facilities would be about what it takes to fight the war for 1 week. It is clear something more must be done, and this impresses me as being a suggestion that deserves our most serious consideration.

job effectively. To cite an example, an employer with 100 employees would determine what the fringe benefits cost him for his youngest group of employees doing work comparable to those of older employees. Using this figure as a base, he would compute the difference between this cost and the cost for all of his other employees in the same job classification. He could claim the total of the difference as a tax credit. Thus, the employer would not suffer the extra cost from his own profits.

Under existing law, an employer may now absorb part of this increased cost as a tax deduction in the normal course of doing business. But under existing procedures he recovers only a fraction of the added cost of hiring or retaining older people. By allowing the employer a full tax credit after he has computed his corporate tax, in addition to his normal tax deduction, he would be able to claim the entire additional cost of hiring older people against his firm's income tax.

I believe the plan is sound and I earnestly hope Congress will approve it just as quickly as possible. I have discussed this proposal with the Legislative Council here in Congress and am assured it is not in conflict with our existing revenue code.

In the name of humanity, in the name of helping our older citizens keep the jobs they now have, and help those unemployed to get employment, I urge speedy approval of this measure.

H.R. 654

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by redesignating section 38 as section 39 and by adding after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. CREDIT FOR EMPLOYMENT OF OLDER PERSONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an employer (as defined in section 3401(d)), there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—The credit allowed an employer by subsection (a) for any taxable year shall be an amount equal to the increase in his cost of doing business during such year which results from the employment of older persons, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. For purposes of this subsection, any expenditure made by an employer in the conduct of his trade or business (including insurance premiums, contributions to pension funds, contributions to medical costs, contributions to workmen's compensation funds, and any other trade or business expense, including the increased cost of training an older worker and increased cost of maintaining an increased medical and nursing staff necessary where older persons are employed, within the meaning of section 162), whether attributable to an individual employee or to the employees of such employer generally, shall be considered an increase in the cost of doing business which results from the employment of older persons to the extent that it would not have been required or made if the age of each employee involved were the lowest age at which an employee could reasonably (and consistently with the sound operation of the trade or business) be hired to perform substantially the same duties (and no factor other than age were taken into account).

"(c) CREDIT NOT TO CAUSE REFUND OF TAX.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under the provisions of this part other than this section and sections 31 and 32.

"(d) CREDIT IN ADDITION TO DEDUCTIONS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be in addition to, and shall not reduce or otherwise affect, any deduction which may be allowable under this chapter."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by striking out

"Sec. 38. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 38. Credit for employment of older persons.

"Sec. 39. Overpayments of tax."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disallowance of credits to individuals paying optional tax or taking standard deduction) is amended by striking out "and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof "35, and 38".

(b) Section 37(a) of such Code (relating to retirement income credit) is amended by striking out "and section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 35 (relating to partially tax exempt interest), and section 38 (relating to credit for employment of older persons)".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for the presentation which the gentleman has made here today with reference to this highly important subject.

I would like to inform the gentleman that the State of Texas, two sessions ago, passed permissive legislation along those lines entitled "Jobs After Forty."

Much help was given to the members of the legislature in support by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in that State. I wish to commend the gentleman, and to offer my pledge of cooperation in his endeavors.

MR. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman. I am glad that the gentleman has brought up the question of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, because certainly this very distinguished organization has been in the forefront in America in trying to come up with ideas and programs which would eliminate the specter faced by the middle-aged and elderly workers who today find it more and more difficult to find employment, even if they are thoroughly qualified. We know there is company after company and industry after industry which, when a worker goes looking for a job, the first question they ask is "How old are you?" If he is past 40 or past 45, no matter how well qualified he may be, no matter how exceptionally good are his qualifications and experience, the personnel officer advises the applicant he is sorry, but the company has a policy against hiring people above 45. That is the end of the interview.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I am glad the gentleman pointed out that Texas has such a program.

This is not a new idea to bar discrimination against hiring practices because of age. That is now the practice in 20 States in America, and I do not see any reason why we should not make this a national policy as long as we have the Civil Rights Act that applies across the board.

MR. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

MR. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement. It is a field we should have looked into a long, long time ago. I am running into this problem every day of people over 40 years of age who cannot find a job, people who are well qualified. I am glad the gentleman is taking the lead in this matter.

MR. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman, and I hope he will follow our hearings with interest. I would strongly recommend we make enough copies available of the Secretary's report yesterday, because for the first time, as far as I know, the U.S. Labor Department has admitted officially that there is a practice of discrimination against hiring people in this country because of age. This is an excellent beginning and with this report now as a basis this Congress can work its will and do something about this problem.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

NEW YORK CITY'S \$16 MILLION ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the expression "Nero fiddled while Rome burned." Now we have a new one to add to it: "While the anti-poverty program and the hopes and dreams of millions of Americans in New York City are going down the drain, our Governor, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, was out doing the Watusi."

Last night Governor Rockefeller of New York vetoed a bill that would have established a corporation to administer the entire anti-poverty program in the city of New York with a budget of more than \$16 million. The manner in which the Governor acted has left many people both bewildered and angry. Word of the Governor's veto reached the Office of Economic Opportunity less than 6 hours before the end of the fiscal year, the deadline OEO had to meet for the allocation of this year's funds.

The Governor knew that failure to meet this deadline would have meant the loss of over \$9 million to New York City's campaign against poverty.

Sargent Shriver, Director of OEO, Mayor Wagner, and officials of the poverty program in New York City were left stunned and confused by the Governor's action, and well they should have been, because the Governor had at no time previously even hinted that he would veto the bill on the grounds that he did. There had been plenty of opportunity during the preparation and passage of

July 1, 1965

14976

this bill for the Governor to express any possible objections to it, but he did not, he waited until 6 hours before the deadline in order to do it. This action, I believe, spotlights his real attitude toward the fight against poverty. Earlier in the week, Governor Rockefeller had expressed objections to certain aspects of the program but he dropped his objections after consultation with antipoverty officials.

Only yesterday morning he informed OEO that his doubts about the program had been removed, yet that very evening he vetoed the bill, threatening to shatter the work of many people over many months, and to throw New York City's antipoverty effort into complete disruption, if not destroy it completely.

If the Governor were sincerely interested in the poverty program in New York City, would he have waited until the last minute to veto the bill? And does it not seem likely that he would have made some positive suggestions for overcoming the difficulties he expressed? He made no such suggestions. He made no constructive comments to indicate that he was even remotely concerned with the success of this necessary program. In order to overcome this completely negative behavior, Sargent Shriver discussed this crisis with New York poverty officials and arrived at a tentative solution. And while these desperate 11th-hour discussions were being conducted, what was the Governor doing? Was he seated around the table aiding the negotiation? Was he suggesting alternatives? Was he contributing ideas? No. As a matter of fact, we are told that the Governor was out dancing.

The solution was reached at 11:45 p.m. last night, just 15 minutes before the deadline. Because Sargent Shriver was dedicated to the ideals and aspirations of the poor all over the United States, New York City now has the more than \$16 million it needs to attack poverty—money that would have gone down the drain.

This is the extent to which the Governor concerned himself with the war against poverty in New York City. As usual, his oft-repeated lip service to this war was not backed with appropriate action.

I am not a Congressman from New York City. I represent an upstate area. Nevertheless, I am extremely concerned over the Governor's actions with respect to the New York City poverty program, because it provides a penetrating insight into his true feelings about the war on poverty. This is just the latest in a long series of barriers and obstacles that the Governor's office has erected to prevent the smooth and efficient operation of the Economic Opportunities Act.

I have spoken out about this before. In my own district and other upstate cities and communities we have seen the Governor's office use its 30-day review period and threat of veto to delay and obstruct local antipoverty programs. We have seen the letter of the law misused to violate the spirit of the law. I am concerned over what happened in New York City because we in the smaller cities and villages of upstate New York are even more at the mercy of the Gov-

ernor's office than that great metropolis. We do not have the political power or organization that they have in New York City. That is why New York State as a whole is lagging so badly in this war on poverty. We simply do not have the leadership—and we are not getting it from Albany.

This abuse of power is not necessarily limited to New York State. We have seen it happen elsewhere, for other reasons. It emphasizes the necessity for amending the law so that the arbitrary use of the veto power can be appealed to a higher authority.

I would like to take this opportunity once more to commend Mr. Shriver for the work that he has done in this particular instance. Mr. Shriver was not out dancing last night. He was working—because he knew how important this money was to help the poor people of New York City.

The Governor put the chestnuts in the fire and then left them for Mr. Shriver to pull out of the fire. And pull them out he did.

It is not too late for Governor Rockefeller to restore the people's faith in his intentions regarding New York City's war against poverty. If he erects no further barriers—if he exhibits an attitude of cooperation and concern, the program can move ahead dynamically along the path on which it has started.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY OF BURUNDI, RWANDA, AND SOMALIA

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, July 1, is the anniversary of the independence of three former trust territories in Africa, Burundi, Rwanda, and Somalia. I take this opportunity to congratulate the leaders and the people of these countries and to extend to them all good wishes for their future growth and development.

I feel a particular interest in these three countries since they were all at one time under the United Nations trusteeship system. As the U.S. Representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Council, I myself participated in various proceedings in the Trusteeship Council and in the fourth committee of the U.N. General Assembly which led to the independence of Burundi and Rwanda in 1962. During my 3 years at the United Nations, I was privileged to acquire the friendship of a number of distinguished and able representatives of Burundi, Rwanda, and Somalia.

These countries face the difficulties common to most of the newly independent countries of Africa. I trust that the United Nations and its family of agencies and the United States will continue to help the peoples of these free countries to solve their economic problems and achieve a rapid pace of development within a framework of political freedom.

The American people feel a kinship for

newly independent countries that have emerged from colonialism. In the legislative branch of our Government, as well as in the executive branch, we extend the hand of friendship to Burundi, Rwanda, and Somalia and our hopes for steady progress toward the realization of their aims and aspirations.

FE *VA* Gallagher
VIETNAM

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Vietcong blew up a restaurant in Saigon and littered the street with broken bodies of women and children and killed a number of Americans. Last week also, the Vietcong took an American they were holding in captivity and shot him down in cold blood. I mention these things to make quite clear the nature of the adversary we are facing in Vietnam.

Early this year when I returned from Vietnam I said on the matter of negotiations, let us walk in dignity to any conference table, but let us not run before anyone is there. Since that time, our President, Lyndon Johnson, has indicated his willingness to take that dignified walk but unfortunately there are those who think this is not good enough and who urge him to run before anyone else is there.

I think it would be useful in the face of this to review just what the President has done to bring the Communists to the conference table and to attempt to reach a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. Last August when Communist torpedo boats attacked our destroyers on the high seas in the Gulf of Tonkin, we took the matter to the United Nations. The President of the Security Council invited North Vietnam to participate. North Vietnam, however, responded by saying that the United Nations had no competence to deal with the war in Vietnam. The Chinese Communists seconded his contention.

Earlier this year, Gordon Walker, of Great Britain, attempted to visit Peiping and Hanoi to seek a peaceful settlement and he was refused.

On April 7 in Baltimore our President stated he was willing to enter into unconditional discussions with any of the concerned governments over the conflict in Vietnam. Hanoi and Peiping responded by calling his proposal a "hoax," "a big swindle," "a lie covered with flowers."

On April 8 the President responded favorably to the 17 nonaligned nation appeal for a peaceful solution through negotiations without preconditions. North Vietnam responded by outlining four conditions which would be necessary before discussions. In sum, these conditions demanded that we accept in advance a Communist South Vietnam. Communist China responded by saying that the 17-nation appeal was perpetrated by "monsters and freaks."

The Indian Government proposed that a combined Afro-Asian force assure the peace in Vietnam and maintain the pres-

ent boundaries so long as the people desire it. We stated that we were interested in this proposal and that we would give it careful consideration and have indeed had further discussions with the Indian Government on it. Hanoi, however, said that the Indian proposal was an offense for the people of South Vietnam and merely another scheme to help the United States rule over South Vietnam. Communist China denounced the proposal also and said India had betrayed the Afro-Asian countries.

Last month, we stopped bombing North Vietnam for 5 days but no indication that North Vietnam was interested in negotiations came forth. Instead, Hanoi called the suspension "a wornout trick" and Communist China denounced it as an American "hoax" and "war blackmail."

Prime Minister Harold Wilson of the United Kingdom has organized a Commonwealth People Mission to travel to the interested countries. We welcomed this initiative but it has been rejected by Moscow and Peiping, and Hanoi has shown little interest.

I think this illustrates quite clearly that the United States is sincere in its desire to settle this affair by negotiation rather than by force. I think this is clear to the Communists.

I think it is clear to the American people, but there are still those who say that this is not enough, more must be done, we must make further efforts, we must demonstrate again our willingness. Now I have no doubt that the President will, as the days wear on, make other moves in the diplomatic field. What these moves will be are tactical decisions that are rightfully in his hands. I see no purpose served by grandstand quarterbacking and by urging him to do more and more and more.

I see some danger in these urgings, however well intentioned they may be. They may well be creating the impression in the Communist world that we are eager to settle the conflict whatever the outcome. They may well be convincing the Communists that if they just hang on a little longer, the United States will grow weary and pull out. Such a miscalculation can only extend, not shorten, the conflict. For while we do not seek a continuation of the fighting, we are utterly determined to do what is necessary, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "down to the very end."

In what ways do these people suggest that the President improve and intensify our diplomatic offensive? Some say that we must make it clear that we will talk to the Vietcong if they come as members of the North Vietnamese delegation. Let us stop right here and consider the Vietcong. Let us consider just who they are. Let us take a good, hard look at these people who massacre innocent children in cold blood. The Vietcong are nothing more than the armed agents of the authorities in Hanoi. We must be completely clear on this point. Over the years Hanoi has sent up to 40,000 armed men into South Vietnam to join those subversive agents which they left behind in violation of the 1954 Geneva Accords. These people have preyed on the weak-

nesses of a new government and nation, and have organized an armed force in the countryside which now threatens the very existence and independence of South Vietnam. These people initiated their activities on the orders of Hanoi and they can stop them on orders from the same place.

This is aggression no less than it was aggression when North Korea threw its divisions across the 38th parallel almost 15 years ago to the day. During those 15 years the Communists have learned that such open aggression is not profitable. They have turned to a more subtle but equally dangerous kind of aggression. They have sent their thousands across the border over the years instead of doing it in just 1 day.

I am disturbed by all of this talk about negotiating with the Vietcong, recognizing their existence as a factor in the situation, because each time we say this, each time we create the impression by loose talk and sloppy language that the Vietcong are anything more than the agents of Hanoi, we encourage Hanoi to believe that we are weakening on this point, that we will indeed agree, if they just press a little harder, to accept the Vietcong as a bargaining agent. These people are no more separate from Hanoi than were those North Korean divisions from Pyongyang.

The Communists, of course, are eager to have the world and us accept these intruders as a separate entity. For then they can perpetuate the fiction that this is a civil war, that these people are not revolting against the Government in Saigon, that they are the "only true representatives of the people of South Vietnam." I must say that I am disturbed by the degree of success that they have had in perpetrating this false word outside of South Vietnam. I purposely say outside of South Vietnam, because it is quite clear that the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front have not succeeded in gathering any significant non-Communist elements into its fold. The people of South Vietnam are not fooled as to the nature of the Vietcong threat and its smoke screen, the National Liberation Front. No opponents of Ngo Dinh Diem even in the most bitter days joined the front. Let me give an example the pilot who bombed Diem's palace in February 1954. This man would not join the front. When he was released from prison after Diem's fall, he did not join the front, he returned to the air force. He recently died over North Vietnam in a bombing attack. He gave his life striking at the home base of those who were trying to conquer his country.

Now, should we talk to these people? The administration has made itself quite clear that Hanoi wishes to include in its delegations some of its agents operating in the south, then this is not a barrier to talks. We need go no further than this. Any more would just run the risk of misleading the Communists into thinking that we were indeed weakening in our resolve not to recognize these aggressors.

It is also said that we must improve our position by saying that we approve of self-determination. Last week a dis-

tinguished Member of the other body stated that we made a mistake in urging Ngo Dinh Diem not to participate in the elections provided for by the 1954 Geneva accords. This ignores the fact that the Geneva accords called for free elections by secret ballot. He did not mention that President Diem at the time said he would participate in such elections but not without assurances that there would indeed be free elections in the north. It was quite clear then and it is clear now that such elections were an absolute impossibility. Perhaps there are those that feel we should atone for President Diem's refusal to commit political suicide by declaring ourselves in favor of self-determination. Here again, however, the administration has made it quite clear that we have no desire to dictate the future of South Vietnam. President Johnson said on April 11 that we seek an independent South Vietnam, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance. What political future such as a South Vietnam would work out for itself will be up to the South Vietnamese. It is quite conceivable that they will decide to have elections after Hanoi's agents have released their grasp on large parts of the Vietnamese countryside.

As to the unification of all of Vietnam, in 1954, we made it quite clear that we favored elections under effective international supervision to reunify all of Vietnam. North Vietnam, however, was not interested in such an approach and there is no reason to believe that they are interested in it now. It is conceivable that once peace is restored that North and South Vietnam might well decide to determine the reunification of the country on the basis of free elections. I do not see this in the foreseeable future, but it is something that has to be worked out after peace is restored.

I notice with considerable concern a new theme that is creeping into public discussion on this matter. Some say that we should not stand in the way of the South Vietnamese having talks with the Vietcong and Hanoi in an effort to solve the conflict. I am puzzled by this proposition. When I was in South Vietnam, I saw no indication whatsoever that the South Vietnamese were interested in anything but freeing their country from the aggressors. I have seen nothing since then which indicates that the South Vietnamese are trying to talk with Hanoi and its agents, the Vietcong. I am disturbed because it is only one step from saying let us not stand in the way of such talks, to saying let us encourage such talks. The South Vietnamese, I believe, would take this very badly. They are fighting for their very existence and they are suffering enormous casualties in doing it. They are not being forced to do this by the United States but rather they have asked the United States to aid them in this struggle. The above proposition has the ugly connotation that this is not the case. In spite of all our involvement, this is a Vietnamese war. They are doing most of the dying and it is their country that is being torn apart. I cannot see how they would not be disturbed and frightening by hearing urging from their allies in this struggle that

14978

they go off and settle this thing with the Vietcong. It seems almost as if we are saying, "Get us off the hook, go talk to the Vietcong, work something out so that we can get out of here." The South Vietnamese know full well that without us Hanoi would clamp its terrible rule on their country. As I said before, this particular line of argumentation disturbs me deeply.

Finally, let us consider the larger aspects of this conflict. We are told that the real problem is not in South Vietnam—that our real interest lies in India which must withstand Chinese Communist expansion. This, however, ignores the fact that the financial resources now used for economic development in India and Pakistan would have to be diverted for military defense if the Communists were free to turn in another direction. We are told that our safety as a nation does not depend on having American troops in South Vietnam. I should point out that the recent increase in troops in South Vietnam was required because a country to which we have been made solemn commitments asked for our assistance to help it maintain its independence against a particularly vicious form of aggression. The President has made it clear that we will pull these troops out when this aggression is stopped. Now, I do not believe that if we pull them out before that time that a flotilla of Chinese Communist junks would appear off the coast of California.

But I do believe that if we wench on this commitment, the rest of our commitments upon which our very existence as a nation depends will be seen as worthless in the eyes of our allies. At issue is our credibility as leader of the free world. Our worldwide commitments are like a seamless fabric. We cannot tear it in one place and expect it to remain the same. I also believe that if we do not fulfill this commitment, the Communist world will be greatly encouraged to initiate these wars of national liberation in other countries that are just as vulnerable as South Vietnam.

The President has chosen to draw the line in South Vietnam. The Communist world must be under no illusions as to our determination to see this thing through. The President has steered the nation on a prudent course through very dangerous waters. He has resisted pressures from those who would abandon South Vietnam and from those who would plunge us into a catastrophic conflict. I supported him at the beginning, and as the need for quiet patience and calm determination in the face of a long struggle is upon us, I continue to support him. His course is worthy of the support that all but a small number of Americans have given him. And it is surprising that no one in this small group of opposition has offered an alternative course short of turning over Asia to the Communists and with it the lives of millions of people who oppose communism and who have faith in our country.

WATER SHORTAGE

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, vast areas of the Nation do not have enough water. More than one-third of our population is gripped by a drought which is already in its fourth year.

In many States, deep wells that have been producing water for 50 years have gone dry. Great hardships have been placed upon rural and urban residents, farmers, and industry. At present, a fair measure of emergency relief is available to farmers in the form of low interest long-term loans, so that they can dig wells, install pumps, and distribution equipment, and take other steps to obtain water. This is provided under the Consolidated Farmer's Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended.

However, the great majority of rural residents are not farmers, and no help is available to them under existing legislation. Emergency assistance is needed now by individual families, entire communities, and industries in rural and semirural areas afflicted by drought. Farmers also need additional assistance beyond that provided for in the act mentioned above. To help provide this emergency drought assistance, I have introduced H.R. 9459.

Briefly, this bill proposes to reduce the impact of drought, in rural and semirural areas, on residents—both farm and nonfarm—industries, commercial establishments, agriculture, and livestock enterprises. Its principal provisions are to provide low-interest long-term loans for the improvement or development of water resources, including technical assistance and equipment such as pumps, water transmission lines, and treatment equipment; matching grants to communities and other public and quasi-public organizations for the same purpose; and matching grants to municipalities up to 50,000 population who must haul water for distribution to their citizens.

This bill also proposes that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to guarantee bonds issued by water districts to obtain loan funds for farm and nonfarm families and industries in small municipalities, for the purpose of developing water resources. In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to issue charters to public authorities or corporations, enabling them to provide water resources for their areas, if no public body is in existence to perform this function now, or where State laws prevent such bodies from being established for this purpose. In my own State of New York, for example, nonprofit corporations may not be formed to obtain loans for developing water resources. In 1964 both houses of the State legislature passed a bill that would have made such corporations legal. The Governor vetoed this bill, and as a result almost 800 nonincorporated communities in New York State which do not have central water systems are unable to take the necessary steps to finance this vital enterprise.

Finally, this bill proposes that a program be established under which surplus feed and seed commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation be

made available to farmers in drought-stricken areas at favorable terms.

Certain kinds of national disasters have long been recognized as requiring Federal assistance. When floods, earthquakes, storms and other acts of God occur, destroying lives and property, the conscience of the Nation is quick to respond to the need created by these emergencies. Severe drought is also a natural disaster. While it does not strike with the sudden and dramatic fury of a hurricane, it can nevertheless be more costly and dangerous. Drought is a quiet intruder. It does not announce its arrival, and we cannot predict its departure. We do not even notice its presence until it has been living with us for some time. And by then it is often too late to avoid its costly consequences.

Generally speaking, when drought strikes, its effects are felt first by our rural areas. H.R. 9459, therefore, has been written to help our rural and semirural areas meet the crisis which now exists in 31 States, and is still spreading.

TOLL BRIDGES: MUST THEY GO ON TOLLING?

(Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this session I introduced a bill to prohibit the creation of interstate authorities having power to divert motor vehicle toll revenues to nonhighway purposes. H.R. 889 was referred to the Committee on Public Works and it has aroused considerable support from the motor vehicle users of our country, at least in the volume of mail I have received in my own office.

Although H.R. 889 does not mention any specific authority or commission by name, its foundation lay in the consistent abuses of authority of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission which directly affects all the people in my district. This commission was established by the mutual agreement of the Legislatures of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and the consent of the Congress of the United States. It was designed, originally, to finance the construction of bridges across the Delaware River, thereby joining highways running through the two neighboring States.

When the commission was approved, toll financing was virtually the only feasible means of paying for such structures. For many years, therefore, the commission served a useful and vital function in the creation of better traveling conditions for residents of the two States and for those who travel through them.

Of recent years, however, the commission has taken upon itself plans and schemes which far outreach the wildest imaginings of either the State legislatures or the Congress which gave their original approval to the commission's stated plans for highway travel facilities on the river.

Last year, for example, in a flagrant departure from its traditional reason for existence, the commission asked the Congress to approve its construction of

July 1, 1965

A3491

Yet Burundi has not been left in peace to face its internal problems and to pursue development programs in medicine, education, communications, agriculture, animal husbandry, and industry. While trying to improve its own situation in a rapidly changing area of the world, the Government must also keep under control the Chinese Communists, who, according to a recent Chinese defector there, want to use the kingdom as a base in central Africa for the encouragement and support of rebel activities in the Congo.

Recently, Burundi plainly showed its disapproval of Chinese Communist activities by severing diplomatic ties with Peiping. The kingdom has demonstrated its neutrality and its unwillingness to aid the spread of rebellion in Africa. It wisely recognizes the importance of achieving internal stability and economic independence to complement its political independence. Under the leadership of Prime Minister Joseph Bemina, Burundi seeks moderation in politics, the integration of its rival racial and political elements, and neutrality in foreign affairs.

Today we see in Burundi a stable government and a channelling of national efforts toward common goals. In achieving political moderation and economic development, we wish the kingdom of Burundi every success.

"Bread Tax" Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD a fine editorial from the June 29 edition of the Des Moines Register which once and for all should dissolve the phony "bread tax" issue raised in reference to wheat legislation.

This editorial is from a great newspaper located in the heart of the agricultural area of our country. The message contained in it does not require an explanation. It is crystal clear. This false issue, now dead, should be properly buried and forgotten in any reasonable discussion of farm programs.

"BREAD TAX" CHARGE

The attack against the wheat acreage diversion and price support program as a "bread tax on consumers" is one of the more cynical pieces of political demagoguery to be practiced lately. This program requires domestic processors of wheat to buy certificates worth 75 cents a bushel and exporters to buy certificates worth 30 cents a bushel. The certificates are given to farmers as part of their payment for complying with acreage restrictions.

Since the certificate program began, the price-support loan on wheat has been reduced from \$2 a bushel to \$1.25. The average "blend" certificate value, which depends on the ratio of domestic to export sales, last year was 43 cents and this year is to be 44 cents. The total support price to wheat growers this year will average \$1.69 per bushel, as compared with \$2 in 1962.

The domestic miller will pay about the same for wheat this year as in 1962, since the market price plus the certificate will cost about \$2 per bushel.

The "bread tax" charge is based on the fact that part of the price support cost now is paid by the public as consumers instead of taxpayers. The flour millers pass on the cost of the certificates in the price of flour.

The "bread tax" charge is cynical because everyone knows the price of bread is only slightly related to the price of wheat. The cost of wheat makes up less than 20 percent of the retail price of bread and other bakery products. About 80 percent of the price is made up of processing and marketing costs.

The total cost of wheat to flour millers is no higher than it was 3 years ago and is lower than it was in the early 1950's when price supports were higher. Yet the prices of bread and other wheat products are considerably higher because of increased labor and other manufacturing costs.

The price of white bread has risen every year since 1950 but not because the price of wheat went up. If the wheat program is extended by Congress and the administration recommendations are approved, the wheat certificates will be increased in value. Since the cost of wheat in a loaf of bread is around 2 cents, raising the certificate value to \$1.25 (a 20-percent increase in the total cost of wheat to the miller) could not justify as much as a 1-cent increase in the price of bread.

If this part of the subsidy is paid in the form of a charge on consumers instead of taxpayers, it cannot affect low-income consumers perceptibly.

Whether it is a good idea to raise the returns to wheatgrowers by any method is a separate question. But the method of a higher certificate value should not be discarded on such phony ground as the "bread tax" argument.

FE *minb*
Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Honolulu Star Bulletin, Mr. William H. Ewing, has written an exceedingly provocative editorial on the question of the direction of the war in Vietnam which I feel deserves attention and thoughtful consideration.

With permission of the House of Representatives, I place this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE ONLY WAY TO DEFEAT CHINA

The United States has now come very near to provoking war with Red China.

There should be no mistake about this. The bombing of targets within 80 miles of the Chinese border, less than the distance between Oahu and Kauai, is on its face a provocation. But on top of this the administration in Washington has not hesitated to make clear that the bombing was aimed at Peiping. An Associated Press report from Washington says:

"Authorities speaking against the back-drop of the latest U.S. bombing raids within 80 miles of the Red Chinese frontier said that it has already been made clear that North Vietnam cannot expect to have a sanctuary in its territory while Hanoi is feeding the war in South Vietnam.

"This note of warning is also being applied to Peiping by U.S. officials who fear that

U.S. restraint may have been misinterpreted by Communist China's rulers."

The Associated Press does not identify the authorities who made these statements. Often the authority is the President himself. No matter who, the experienced reporters, who work for the Associated Press in Washington do not make such attributions without knowing that the spokesman does, in fact, represent the administration.

The same story goes on to say:

"A feeling of strong resentment has run through administration circles as the result of the harsh tone of Peiping's rejection of the British Commonwealth effort to seek a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam struggle.

"Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Britain was called a nitwit in official Chinese Communist rejection of a Commonwealth peace mission's call. In Washington this was looked upon as extremely harsh language which demonstrated clearly that there is no interest in any peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war except on Communist terms. * * * Authorities said it will be up to the Communist side to decide what happens next."

What kind of policy is it that is predicated on whether the other side speaks harshly or gently? Our policymakers should have known, though they obviously did not know, that the air raids on North Vietnam would not force the Communists to submit; that, on the contrary, the raids would more likely harden the enemy's resistance and determination. This, on the basis of all the evidence available, is what has now happened.

We ought to know now that dropping bombs within a few miles of the Red China border is most likely to have the same effect. The aim, as conceived in Washington, is to force the Communists to come to the conference table. The opposite result is much more probable—to drive them away. The fact is that the Communists, within sight of winning in South Vietnam, will negotiate when they judge it to be in their interest to do so, and not before.

On March 31, after our policymakers had announced we would punish North Vietnam with bombings in order to halt its support of the Vietcong and to produce peace negotiations, this newspaper editorially raised the question: What if the bombing fails?

The bombing, after over 4 months, has now, it appears, failed. That is, it has neither stopped northern Communist aid to the Vietcong nor has it produced a peace conference. In fact, along with Red China and the Soviet Union, country after country of the so-called uncommitted bloc has refused to attend a peace meeting proposed by Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Britain.

So what do we do now? Do we bomb Hanoi? Do we cross the border into Red China? If it is logical to bomb North Vietnam for "feeding" the war in the south, is it not also logical to bomb Red China whence came the war stores in the first place? The "authorities" quoted by the Associated Press say it will be up to the Communist side to decide what happens next. This states clearly enough that we will hold the Communists responsible for what we ourselves do.

Regardless of all else, let us keep clearly in mind one dark and monstrous prospect: If we get into a war with Red China, we will never win it without resort to nuclear weapons. Are we willing to face this prospect? In a showdown, we would have to expect that Moscow would provide Peiping with modern conventional weapons—supersonic fighters, heat-seeking air-to-air missiles, etc.—to defend itself against American attack. We could never win a conventional war against China, and the Chinese know it. We ought to know it. We could win it, but only with our nuclear arsenal. Are we ready for that, and the general holocaust almost certain to follow? We ought to face up to this before we take the final step that almost surely would lead that way.

A3492

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 1, 1965

Charge to the Class of 1965, by Dr.
Elvis Stahr, President, Indiana University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, recent events on some college campuses have shocked and alarmed the country. College administrative machinery has been halted by unruly mobs of demonstrators. A so-called free speech movement degenerated into a "filthy speech movement" marked by placards bearing four-letter words. Some student organizations have called upon our Government to betray its friends, abandon its commitments abroad and accommodate its sworn enemies. The question "What are the purposes of a university?" has often been asked, but the need for an answer is more imperative than ever before.

A brilliant and perceptive answer was given at Indiana University's commencement ceremonies on June 14, 1965, by the president, Dr. Elvis Stahr. Indiana University is one of this country's great educational institutions; it is my alma mater and I am proud to say that it has generally remained free of the disorder and unrest that has plagued some others.

Dr. Stahr reminded the class of 1965 that while their degrees are conferred with "all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities thereto appertaining," they must give special attention to the matter of responsibilities. This wise and sound injunction is, unfortunately, all too seldom heard today, and Dr. Stahr's remarks are worthy of careful consideration by all Americans:

CHARGE TO THE CLASS OF 1965

Members of the class of 1965, today—this morning—the work of many years will culminate for each of you in a brief sentence—a remarkably simple procedure in contrast to the educational experience which it certifies and the success which it symbolizes. Just so, rituals often capture in capsule the accumulated past and the implications of the future.

There is an essential difference in this ceremony of commencement. No oath will be required of you, no promises, no "I do." It is as if what this signifies is its own guarantee of future performance. Educated, you will perform as educated men and women.

In a few moments you will receive your degrees, conferred with "all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities thereto appertaining." Let us look briefly at these concomitants of your degrees.

The rights and privileges are relatively obvious. You will have letters which you are entitled to use after your name. You will have evidence of achievement to support your qualifications for a field of employment. Wherever a college education is a requirement for membership, you will have your passport. And, importantly, you will always belong to the special group of men and women who share Indiana University as their alma mater.

It is to the third word of the trio, "rights, privileges, and responsibilities," that I would draw your attention with the emphatic hope that you will never forget, will always honor,

the unspoken promise of responsibility which is inherent in your bearing of a university degree.

The world may reasonably expect a different performance of its educated citizens. Yet cultured speech, broadened knowledge, refined tastes, even training for a profession are but partial and circumstantial evidences of formal education, however useful they may be in your careers and in your lives. The fullness of the implication in the word "responsibilities" lies beyond these, in the realm of choice, of values, and of understanding.

As you have pursued the mastery of your particular discipline, there has matured in you a pattern of seeking information, weighing it with increasingly discriminating judgment, formulating its expression, and then learning from its criticism by a faculty member and sometimes by your fellow-students. This is the educative process, a process which—if you have understood it well—will become one of the most valuable assets you will have in the furtherance of your personal and professional lives. It takes an individual act of liberation, not always conscious, to transfer this process to all of your experience—from the classroom to the experience outside.

Yet this transference is expected of you as educated men and women, and particularly in the opinions, choices, values and judgments that will characterize your adult lives.

For each of you this means that your opinions must be based on information, carefully weighed and thoughtfully expressed. This means that your judgment of issues should be responsible and unprejudiced by ignorance, propaganda, or inverted values. This gives to your acts a special significance—for you are educated people, certified representatives of the educational program of a great university, and the embodiment of her expectations. As the Honorable Adlai Stevenson well observed: "In the serene title of university is meant more than a wide curriculum and a general seeking after knowledge. It implies too that the men and women who come from it will have in them some sense of the universal experience of mankind."

Much of mankind has come a long, hard way from his primitive origins. In fighting his way forward through the centuries man has sought above all else civilization. The civilizing process has brought some understanding of such values as decency, fairness, good manners, and consideration for the rights of others, values little known and less regarded in the jungle and the cave. Simple virtues such as gentleness and personal cleanliness are marks of civilization, just as are more complex virtues like the creation of beauty in art or poetry or music—or the courage to walk in space.

To know and understand from the long experience of mankind that flaunting the proprieties is only tasteless tilting at windmills; that ignoring others' rights is denying the basis of all right; that championing disorder for itself is courting anarchy—to know and understand this is the reasonable expectation we have of you men and women who go from Indiana University with some sense of the universal experience of mankind.

Today the concerns of thoughtful Americans extend from the emerging African nations to the painful struggles of Vietnam; from the threat of Asian aggression to the war on poverty; from the revolutions of Latin America to the campaign for civil rights; from overpopulation to the Communist strategy of deception. If you fail to bring into your consideration of these problems, vital to all of humanity, the discipline of informed opinion and balanced judgment which you have learned, or had the opportunity to learn, in your years at IU, you disavow the degree you will take away from this campus today.

I anticipate and can readily understand an immediate objection: that neither time nor resources will be available for careful research into each issue; yet, to reserve opinion is to be a perpetual fencesitter.

My answer is simply this: if such issues cannot beg your time; if war and ignorance, deprivation and hatred, the dilemmas of freedom and restraint, cannot claim the thoughtful attention of educated men and women, then the degrees we confer today are meaningless symbols and our ceremony a tragic rehearsal. For it is from the thoughtless that the zealot and the bigot recruit—from the uninquiring and closed mind; from those who, without interest in being truly informed, lend their enthusiasms to prejudice and their energies to persecution.

Education should be liberating; should be self-renewing; should be your lifelong pleasure. For, as Joseph Addison wisely wrote: "Education is a companion which no misfortune can depress, no crime can destroy, no enemy can alienate, no despotism can enslave. At home a friend, abroad an introduction, in solitude a solace, and in society an ornament. It chastens vice, it guides virtue, it gives, at once, grace and government to genius. Without it, what is man? A splendid slave, a reasoning savage."

Educated men and women with "all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities thereto appertaining," I charge you to accept fully the role into which you graduate today. You have the ability to act, the training to think, and the potential to lead. Bring with these eagerness for responsible participation in the affairs of mankind and you will invest with lasting honor the symbols that are joined to your names today. For it is only as you become more than individuals, as your concerns encompass wider and nobler things than your own ego, and as you then become a voice in the land, that there can be, as Max Friedman expressed so well 5 years ago this commencement weekend, a hope of "reaching across barricades of hate and fear to that nobler and more spacious day in which men of goodwill will put prosperous hands and creative minds to building a world in which all the weak at last will be safe, because the strong have learned to live and work with generosity and with compassion."

As you go from here, I officially and personally offer to each of you heartfelt and affectionate best wishes. I speak for the faculty and your deans in wishing godspeed to you all and in thanking you for all you have contributed, in your years with us, to the betterment of this that is now your alma mater.

President's Goal Is America the Beautiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, our citizens have long been concerned about the growing ugliness along our highways and byways, and many have expressed full support for the efforts of President and Mrs. Johnson to beautify our land.

I know this is a deep concern to my colleagues, and I am pleased to bring to their attention the following editorial from the Houston Chronicle of May 27 concerning the President's proposals to make our country more beautiful:

Poles Admit "Good Life" Has Thin Veneer**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas Nuzum, chief of the Chicago Tribune's Paris bureau, has just completed an auto tour of Poland and has been reporting his observations in past weeks. One of the most interesting of his articles dealt with the comments of individual citizens, and because of the contradiction between this report and the position of the State Department that the Polish Communist regime is liberalizing, I place the article which appeared in the June 27 Chicago Tribune in the Record for review by the Members.

POLES ADMIT "GOOD LIFE" HAS THIN VENEER
(By Thomas Nuzum)

WARSAW, June 26.—The casual visitor's impression is that Poles lead normal lives, are reasonably happy, and adequately fed and clothed. They seem to feel free to do about anything—except criticize their Government.

Nobody complained—as long as this reporter was with official interpreters.

A third of the strangers registered some complaint when I was alone and could communicate in English, French, broken German, or Polish.

REMAINDER ARE CONTENT

An equal number expressed contentment with the regime, but many of these held official jobs. The remainder seemed neutral.

One man used to improve his English by viewing films at the American Embassy, but he is afraid to go there since hearing on a Voice of America broadcast that the Embassy was bugged with police microphones. Bugging was not disclosed by the Polish press.

Police controls have been much looser since bread riots in 1956 brought Wladyslaw Gomulka to the head of Poland's Communist Party, one critic of communism told me. This Pole charged that looser controls were possible because many people were jailed "even for joking about the regime. Nowadays we know enough to keep our traps shut."

A professor, unemployed for years because he was not a party member, got off the dole and onto a faculty. He thinks life is infinitely better than before 1956, but longs to leave the country.

"HAPPY" SONG A THEME

The Polish equivalent of "happy birthday" is a song called "Sto Lat" (100 years). Citizens sang it to wish Gomulka 100 years' life when he came to power. They believed he would bring them a greater measure of freedom.

Since then, "Sto Lat" has symbolized revolt and hope.

That hope was disappointed by the Gomulka government, averred one man. "Therefore, we do not feel like singing 'Sto Lat' at birthday parties that fall on election days. They remind us of the regime."

Another time, a Pole looked around to see if anybody was overhearing our conversation. Finally he wrote what he hesitated to say aloud—that students sang "Sto Lat" (with its anti-Communist implications) for Robert Kennedy during his visit last year.

People were inspired with hope in 1956, especially by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski's calls for freedom, said one citizen, but hope was succeeded by disappointment he charged: "Today we feel only apathy."

VOTE HEAVY, CHOICE SMALL

About 99 percent voted in the Polish parliamentary election on May 30, although in most cases their only choice was between several candidates endorsed by the Communist-dominated People's Front.

"We voted because otherwise an official comes around before the polls close and asks why you haven't," two men explained.

A snaggle-toothed peasant was asked if living conditions were not better than before the war. He threw up his hands and laughed, indicating he couldn't reply to that sort of question. When I pressed for an answer, he replied, "NI demokracja (it is not a democracy)."

About 6,000 Poles emigrate each year to America, the full quota, and there is a 5-year waiting list. Most emigrants say they are leaving for reasons economic rather than political.

CITES OTHER EMIGRANTS

Fifteen percent emigrating under the American quota are Poles living in France, Britain, and other countries, which indicates their standard of living in those countries is not too satisfactory.

Of those leaving Poland, the majority come from the tiny sandy farms around Rzeszow and Kielce. These areas were main sources of immigration before World War I. Most of those leaving now have relatives established in America to help them.

One sees posters reading "hands off Viet Nam," but only two Poles mentioned the subject. When asked if he disapproved of American participation in that war, a man said:

"No, because I only know what I read in our own newspapers about it."

No Dictation for Young Republicans**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in all of the maze of postmortems which have followed the election, several points remain clear through all of the smoke and dust. Most Republicans do not want our party to become a Socialist cousin of the already hopelessly Socialist Democrat Party. We must stand for those principles which are time honored and correct. It is obvious that we need to do better selling job and many areas of self-criticism are justified. Republicans have always responded with new ideas. We must remember that the Republican Party is still the best hope for a strong America and the only hope for the preservation of the free enterprise system and our entire basis of individual opportunity and worth. While some may choose the course of expediency and collaboration, most Republicans surely stand firm in this principle.

One of the ideas which has been thrown around is to undermine the autonomous nature of our Young Republican National Federation. I well recall when I was Young Republican National

Federation chairman how the Democrats operated. Chairman Butler had a very capable assistant, Dick Murphy, now with the Post Office Department, who in effect was executive director of the Young Democrats. The Democrats elected a national chairman but he was on an equal or possibly inferior basis with my good friend Dick Murphy. We want none of this in the Young Republicans. We appeal to young Americans on the basis of individuality and a flat rejection of bossism. Any chairman, committee, or group which advocates dictating to the Young Republicans should have the total opposition of our more than one-half million Young Republicans throughout the country. Any chairman, committee, or group who would remove the time-honored concept of independence of the Young Republicans is wrong and Young Republicans should never bow to this type of insult. I for one will vigorously oppose any effort to stamp the Young Republicans into a mold of oppression and dictation whatever the benevolent reasons might be. One party advocating dictation of our economic and political life and practicing it in its party operations is certainly enough.

Extra Duty**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the principle of civilian control of the military and Government is one that has long been cherished in this country. Like all such principles, if it is to be preserved, it must be carefully guarded. The appointment of General McKee as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency does not destroy this tenet of our democracy, but it represents an encroachment that if consistently repeated could render the principles meaningless. The encroachment has proceeded to the point where 94 retired and active regular officers enjoys executive assignment in the Federal Aviation Agency.

The question is not whether General McKee and these other officers are qualified for their positions. The real question involves whether or not the principle of the civilian control of the military and of the Government is being eroded. I am sure that all of my colleagues will want to remain informed on this important question of principle. With this in mind I call attention to an editorial in the Milwaukee Sentinel.

EXTRA DUTY

Is the Johnson administration becoming topheavy with military men in civilian jobs? Rumblings are beginning to be heard that it is. The main cause for this discontent is President Johnson's nomination of a retired general, William F. McKee, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Some Senators, notably Democratic ones, are objecting to having a man with a military background named to head an agency that the law requires be headed by a civilian.

July 1, 1965

Nevertheless, the Senate has passed a bill waiving the requirement that the head of the FAA be a civilian, thus clearing the way for McKee's appointment.

AMONG HIGHEST PAID OFFICIALS

Should McKee be confirmed, he would be among the highest paid officials in the executive and legislative branches of the Government, with the exception of the President and Vice President. In addition to \$30,000 a year he would get as FAA head, he gets \$8,404 a year in military retirement pay. McKee would not be alone as a retired military officer in a top civilian job. The flap over his appointment has focused attention on the fact that there are 41 retired generals and admirals in high places in the Johnson administration.

Since last December, reports Senator PEARSON, Republican, of Kansas, approximately 2,225 retired military officers have joined the executive branch. Furthermore, he says, it is estimated that roughly 30,000 persons presently serving within the Government are former military officers.

This proliferation of the military influence in the executive branch raises some serious questions. Foremost is the question of what effect this has on the American tradition of Government that the military is subject to civilian control.

In his farewell address in 1961, President Eisenhower issued a warning that bears repeating now:

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."

Another question raised by the swelling of the military in civilian government ranks is whether the Government's military retirement policies are in need of change.

DUAL SALARIES SERVE PURPOSE

Congress last year passed a Dual Compensation Act. Under its provisions, retired military personnel may enter the Federal Government in a civilian capacity without foregoing retirement pay. This was done to enable the Government to compete with private enterprise for the valuable talents of military officers. The influx of military men into Federal civilian jobs testifies to the success of the Dual Compensation Act in accomplishing its purpose. Of course, the Federal Government cannot renege on the retirement contracts it has with military officers. But the question is whether the Government is not retiring its officers too soon. The retired officers still have several years of service left in them, as the McKee case demonstrates.

The whole matter needs looking into.

Republic of Rwanda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of this distinguished body that today is the third anniversary of the Republic of Rwanda.

This republic has expended great effort to institute technical and economic reforms. Accordingly, the people stand ready to profit from the advantage of having a government which has been able to catch a clear vision of the goals of a democratic society.

FE (VN) Vivian
Resolution on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a communication from the Reverend Dr. Hoover Rupert, president of the Ann Arbor-Washtenaw Council of Churches, informing me that the Ann Arbor-Washtenaw Council had adopted the thoughtful and reasonable resolution on Vietnam promulgated by the National Council of Churches.

I am privileged to represent a district containing a large number of outstanding clerical and lay Christian leaders; these men and women invariably involve themselves in the vital social issues of the day, thereby enriching our communities and, I am sure, adding to their own Christian experience.

Mr. Speaker, the National Council of Churches resolution supports President Johnson's quest for peace in Vietnam; it supports his offer to add enormous American resources to help develop the Mekong River Valley. I am proud that the Ann Arbor-Washtenaw Council adopted this resolution. I am sure the resolution is supported by the vast majority of our Members, and under unanimous consent place it in full at this point:

ANN ARBOR-WASHTENAW COUNCIL
OF CHURCHES,

Ann Arbor, Mich., May 24, 1965.

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VIVIAN: At the regular meeting of the board of directors of the Ann Arbor-Washtenaw Council of Churches, May 18, 1965, the following resolution, adopted by the Board of the National Council of Churches, on February 25, 1965, was unanimously supported:

Recognizing the concern of the United States for the freedom and independence of all peoples;

Acknowledging our responsibility to the people of South Vietnam who have been depending upon our aid;

Expressing our distress at the continued violence, war and loss of life of all the peoples involved;

Believing that mankind must learn to settle its disputes around the conference table rather than on the battlefield;

Welcoming the initiative taken by the Secretary General of the United Nations in the present crisis and sharing his conviction that "only political and diplomatic methods of negotiation and discussion may find a peaceful solution" to the problem;

Conscious that there are many difficulties and dilemmas facing our country in negotiations for political settlement, but mindful also of the seriousness of prolonged military conflict, the danger of escalation of hostilities, and the possibility of a third world war;

The General Board of the National Council of Churches urges the U.S. Government:

To engage in persistent efforts to negotiate a cease-fire and a settlement of the war which will attempt to achieve the independence, freedom, and self-determination of the people of South Vietnam;

To utilize United Nations assistance in achieving a solution and in seeking to reduce

the area of conflict by effective border control and internal policing; and

To give bold and creative leadership to a broad international development program for the Mekong region and to continue full-scale U.S. economic and technical assistance where necessary.

The general board pledges support and cooperation in the urgent tasks of reconciliation and reconstruction in Vietnam.

In addition, we wish to give our support to President Johnson's indication of our Government's willingness to participate in discussion without preconditions.

We would further wholeheartedly support President Johnson's offer of \$1 billion to be used to implement a large-scale economic development of the Mekong River and his suggestion that it be channeled through the offices of the Secretary General of the United Nations.

We finally urge our U.S. Government to honor its commitment to the principle of maintaining international peace and security through cooperative efforts to which we pledged our country when we signed the United Nations Charter. We call upon our Government to use the mediating services of the international community and especially the services of the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. RACHEL ANDRESEN,

Executive Secretary.

The Reverend Dr. HOOVER RUPERT,
President,

Commentary of Joseph F. McCaffrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recent discussion concerning the role of the office of the Architect of the Capitol prompted the distinguished journalist Joseph McCaffrey to comment on this matter.

I place Mr. McCaffrey's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

COMMENTARY OF JOSEPH F. MCCAFFREY

The critics of Capitol Architect J. George Stewart always make much of the fact that Mr. Stewart is not an architect.

The Washington Post recites this litany: "J. George Stewart is not an architect." So what.

There have been eight men who have served as Architect of the Capitol. Only three—three of these eight men—have been architects.

One of the original designers of the Capitol Building itself, and the first Architect of the Capitol, was not only not an architect he was a doctor of medicine—Dr. William Thornton.

Since 1865—100 years ago—there has not been a man who has served as Architect of the Capitol who has been, by profession, an architect.

So why the fuss over George Stewart, who is not an architect?

The job, basically, is that of property manager for the U.S. Congress. It has been so regarded and so treated by the Members of Congress. There is not now, nor has there ever been any requirement that the man who holds the job be an architect. And, as I said, the record which is easily available shows that no architect has held the position of Architect of the Capitol in the last 100 years.

Appendix

West Virginian John C. Neely Authors Informative Article on Investigating Violations of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, constructive amendments to the Social Security Act over the years have brought under its coverage provisions a growing number of beneficiaries. Enactment of a program of medical aid to the elderly through the social security system would significantly increase the number of persons on the rolls.

Unfortunately, it is to be expected that certain misguided individuals will try to take advantage of the system and will use fraudulent means in the attempt to obtain money from the trust funds. It is the hope of these dishonest persons that the relatively few fraudulent claims will escape detection among million of legitimate ones.

Fortunately, the Social Security Administration is equipped with proven procedures and highly trained personnel which make it extremely difficult for the unprincipled to abuse social security programs.

In the June issue of the Police Chief magazine there appears a helpful and informative article entitled "Investigating Violations of the Social Security Act," by John C. Neely. Mr. Neely is Chief of the Investigations Section, Violations Branch, Social Security Administration. He began his Government service career in 1940 in the Los Angeles office of the Collector of Internal Revenue, transferring in 1945 to Baltimore as a special agent in the Intelligence Division of IRS. In 1959 he came to the Social Security Administration to head the newly formed Violations Branch in the Division of Claims Policy.

Mr. Neely is a son of the late and distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Hon. Matthew M. Neely, who served the citizens of the Mountain State so effectively in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. It was following the death of Senator Neely in 1958 that I was elected to serve the unexpired portion of his term in the U.S. Senate.

Another son, Hon. Alfred Neely, is Judge of the Criminal and Juvenile Courts of Marion County, W. Va.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concisely written article by John Neely be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

[From the Police Chief, June 1965]

INVESTIGATING VIOLATIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

(By John C. Neely)

Within the framework of the Social Security Administration, which administers a program of social insurance benefits for persons who are aged, disabled, widowed, and orphaned, investigators in the Violations Branch, Division of Claims Policy, find themselves performing their duties in an area that is distinct from the main thrust of the program.

In meetings with enforcement personnel from other agencies, I am very often asked two questions: "Don't you experience difficulties in getting U.S. attorneys and the courts to take an interest in social security prosecution cases, in view of the fact that many of the beneficiaries are aged, the witnesses who must give testimony are often of advanced age also and may be suffering from mental deterioration, and the amounts of money involved usually are small? If you get a conviction followed by a relatively substantial sentence, doesn't this do harm to your public image in view of the fact that you are taking such actions within the framework of what is basically a beneficial agency?" The answer to the first question is a conditional "Yes" and to the second, a conditional "No." Before going into detail concerning the approach which has been successfully used by Violations Branch people in dealing with these problems, let us review the growth of the program, the establishment of the Violations Branch in 1959, and the types of violations of the Social Security Act which are punishable as crimes.

High officials involved in fraud detection and deterrent activities in benefit-paying agencies seem to be in substantial agreement that the original interviewer in the local office is the first line of defense against fraudulent claims, since he is in a position to detect fraud at its inception. This role is carried out in the Social Security Administration's fraud prevention program by alert district office personnel. Continuing vigilance is maintained regardless of whether one claim in a hundred, one claim in a thousand, or one claim in a million turns out to be fraudulent since one of our goals is to prevent fraud whenever and wherever it raises its head. Individuals seeking to defraud the Social Security Administration or one of its claimants usually employ approaches and methods that are depressingly familiar to the seasoned interviewer.

Since the beginning of the program, the Social Security Administration has borne these things in mind. While its policies and procedures are geared to the bulk of its 3 million new claims a year and 20 million beneficiaries already in payment status, it has identified and incorporated guidelines that set certain cases apart from the routine and signal the need for more than minimal development and documentation.

Congressional amendments to the Social Security Act over the years brought under its coverage provisions, large additional groups of persons and increased benefit amounts to the point where self-styled accountants and others began looking upon the program as a potential source of substantial illicit revenue. Considerable thought and much ingenuity went into the conjuring of methods whereby improper payments could be syphoned from the so-

cial security trust funds. For example, certain persons who had formerly concentrated on Federal income tax matters and who had engaged in questionable practices in that regard turned their attention to social security claims and coupled the preparation of false tax returns with assistance to claimants in filing for social security benefits based on fictitious earnings. They thereafter collected an unconscionable portion of the first benefit check received by the beneficiary. It is usually surprising to persons unfamiliar with the provisions of the Social Security Act to learn that it is possible for a retroactive benefit check, under certain circumstances, to amount to as much as \$5,000 or more. Unscrupulous persons, who persuade a claimant whom they have "helped" to agree to surrender his first check when it is received, may skillfully avoid any mention of this possibility so that the claimant is under the impression that the first check will be the same amount as his subsequent regular monthly benefit checks. The Violations Branch has been especially interested in making investigations of situations involving this type of activity. Under the Social Security Act, persons can be prosecuted for attempting to perpetrate frauds against the trust funds and also for violating the fee-charging provisions of the act. A non-attorney who charges any fee or any attorney who charges a fee in excess of the amount prescribed by our regulations, without prior authorization, commits a violation punishable under our act regardless of whether fraud is involved.

It was recognized that increasing inducements to commit fraudulent acts (that is, the larger benefit amounts and the special provisions incorporated into the law from time to time which made it possible in some instances to obtain benefits on the basis of short-term earnings) together with normal program growth would result in increasing numbers of fraud situations even if the ratio of fraud to nonfraud cases were to remain roughly the same. In view of this situation, in 1959 the Violations Branch was formed in the Division of Claims Policy, and persons with a law background and/or investigative experience were chosen to comprise a small group, with an investigations section, to make selected investigations throughout the United States, operating from the central office in Baltimore, Md. Through the cooperation of Mr. H. Alan Long, Director, Intelligence Division, Internal Revenue Service, the investigators were given intensive training in the U.S. Treasury Law Enforcement Officers' Training School in Washington, D.C. There is considerable parallel in the work of the special agents in Internal Revenue Service and the social security investigators, since false wage and self-employment tax returns are very often involved in cases investigated by both groups.

And now to answer the first question which other enforcement people usually ask concerning possible difficulties encountered in trying to bring social security violators to trial. It is true that one of our problems has been the need to convince some U.S. attorneys, all of whom express a desire to be cooperative but many of whom are understaffed and overworked, that our cases are important enough—even in terms of money—to justify that portion of their time which is required to process and present our cases for indictment and trial. By reference to the abridged life expectancy tables

July 1, 1965

of the United States, and in view of the fact that advanced age need not be a factor in all benefit situations, we have been able to demonstrate to those U.S. attorneys that thousands of dollars could be paid out, even where monthly benefits are not very large, in cases where false claims go undetected and payments continue over a period of many years. Our investigators, working through the Office of the General Counsel, have been very successful in this regard, as has been shown in recent years by the increased percentage of cases sent to the U.S. attorneys which have been accepted for prosecution. We have managed to have our cases reach Federal grand juries or result in the filing of criminal informations in more than 60 percent of those in which prosecution has been recommended by the Violations Branch. Of these, approximately 80 percent have resulted in convictions. There have been very few acquittals and the majority of nonconviction cases have resulted from negative grand jury actions or dismissals by the court for a variety of reasons which could not properly be considered when the decisions to recommend prosecution were made by the Violations Branch.

Our investigative staff is small and it is not possible for us to investigate every matter which is referred for investigation. We usually try to participate in on-the-scene investigations of cases involving large-scale "claims-fixers" (persons or firms encouraging others to file false returns and claims and/or encouraging them to file honest claims and thereafter charging unauthorized fees), sensitive situations involving factors which make investigation by local people undesirable, and other cases in which a need to use highly skilled and specially trained investigators is indicated.

Following preparation by the investigator of his factual report covering an investigation, the report, together with all of the other evidence in the case, is meticulously reviewed by a law-trained claims policy specialist in the Appraisal Section of the Violations Branch. Based on the report and the exhibits, the criminal violation aspects may be closed. However, if prosecution is deemed appropriate, a statement of facts containing a recommendation for prosecution is prepared for transmittal to the U.S. attorney by the appropriate section in the Office of the General Counsel. Cases developed by field people, as well as cases investigated by our own Violations Branch, are handled in this way. If the U.S. attorney requires additional information or specialized investigation, he may request one of our investigators to go into the judicial district and discuss the case with him and thereafter make additional development and/or appear before the grand jury as a Government witness. The Violations Branch also makes investigations of certain types of cases involving alleged improper conduct on the part of employees of the Social Security Administration as well as of cases involving an employee's alleged participation in a fraudulent claim. At the present time, we are sending out monthly benefit checks to approximately 20 million beneficiaries, amounting to \$1.4 billion per month. Thus, it can be seen that constant alertness to any and all indicia of fraud is vital to the integrity of the program, and our goal is to prevent this vast tide of benefit payments from obscuring those fraud situations, however few and however small, by assuring that they will not be "buffered" up and carried along without detection.

And now to answer the second question which is frequently asked as to whether efforts to deal punitively with known offenders may not do harm to our status as a beneficial agency. The answer to this question is "No." Prosecutions involving individual claimants have, for the most part, been limited to flagrant violations, and the benefit of every doubt is given to suspects in preparing these cases for possible prosecution. Of course, if

enforcement activities and the necessary work performed in connection with those activities are not kept in their proper perspective, the excellent public relations which we enjoy could certainly be severely damaged. The trust funds belong to the people and benefit amounts paid out to those properly entitled constitute a right, not a privilege. We would not want the public to get the idea that every person who files a claim for benefits under proper circumstances is going to be challenged in the sense that he may be made to feel that he must overcome a presumption that his claim is not legitimate. On the other hand, we want the bulk of our claimants—the honest ones—to have complete confidence in the integrity of our administration of the social security program.

Clarence Darrow, the famous trial lawyer, came to this conclusion:

"A man cannot be classified as honest or dishonest. He goes along with the game of life and can stand a certain amount of pressure for the sake of ideals. But at a given point, he can stand no more."

We strive to identify the man or woman who has reached or passed this point and thereafter deal with him (or her) in a special way, without allowing the discovery of a violation to change the basic approach used in the day-to-day claims-taking process. Occasionally, dealing with offenders in a special way will involve prosecution, conviction the imposition of fines, and even incarceration in a penal institution. Undoubtedly, the persons who are directly involved in these situations, their friends, and members of their immediate families may, and probably will, be offended by such special treatment and our popularity may very well deteriorate from their personal point of view. By the same token, our honest claimants would be justified in feeling resentment if our failure to take action in such matters should indicate to them that our stewardship of the funds on which so much of their future depends is not of the highest standards.

Curtailment of Railway Post Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of improved postal services for the people of this Nation. There has been a continued curtailment of such services—the latest being the discontinuance of railway post offices on trains across the country.

In the case of my State of Nebraska, the Nebraska Federation of Postal Clerks has presented evidence that in some cases the curtailment of railway post offices will cause delays in the delivery of mail of up to 24 hours. I certainly do not call this improving postal service and I think most of my colleagues will agree.

In this regard I would call attention to a resolution which was passed unanimously by the delegates to the Nebraska convention of the Nebraska Federation of Postal Clerks this month.

RESOLUTION No. 3

Whereas the postal service is steadily in a process of decay, due to gradual curtailment of services; and

Whereas the most efficient method of han-

dling mail is to work it by the en route method of distribution made by mobile clerks; and

Whereas the postmaster general plans to fit all railway post office and highway post office service into the new pattern of sectional center distribution, and

Whereas a thousand level 5 railway post offices clerks have been lost to us since 1962 and this meat-ax method will further cut our ranks; and

Whereas when mail revenue has been stopped the railroads discontinue trains and railroad employees are forced out of work and the small towns are further harmed by poorer mail service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Federation of Postal Clerks in convention in Lincoln on June 4 and 5, 1965, go on record as being inalterably opposed to the curtailment of service on Omaha and Ogden trains 27 and 28 and Omaha and Denver 17 and 8. That we also inform the Department that we will oppose with all our facilities the future proposals for reduction in any of the remaining few railway post offices in Nebraska; and be it further

Resolved, We devote all our energies to this end and, if necessary, send a full delegation to Washington and voice our opposition and views on this important subject; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our national officers to use all media of press, radio, and TV to inform the public of this loss of service to them.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the delegates to the Nebraska convention of the Nebraska Federation of Postal Clerks and is hereby forwarded to all Nebraska Congressmen and Senators.

DONALD J. URWILLER,

Secretary-Treasurer, Nebraska Federation of Postal Clerks.

W.H. Caba Thurmond
Execution of American Army Sergeant by
Vietcong—No Sympathy From White
House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "No Call From the White House," published in the Columbia Record of Columbia, S.C., of June 28, 1965. The editorial makes a point that has caused considerable concern to many people throughout the South and elsewhere in the country. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NO CALL FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

During the spring demonstrations in Mississippi, a white woman civil rights worker was slain on the highway. The Nation was shocked by the crime. President Johnson called the woman's husband and offered his condolences in a televised telephone conversation. Vice President HUMPHREY went personally to express the Government's grief and sorrow.

Last weekend the President stopped over in Missouri to exchange expressions of mutual admiration with the former Presi-

July 1, 1965

A3487

dent, Harry S. Truman. Johnson went on to San Francisco, where his plea before the United Nations for peace was accepted with startling coolness.

At the same time a widowed mother in Perryville, Ark., wept for one of her three soldier sons. An Army sergeant, he was captured by the Communist Vietcong and executed in reprisal for the punishment of Red terrorists. The Nation was shocked by the savage brutality of the murder.

Friends and relatives streamed into the frame house where she lived. They expressed their concern and sympathy in small town tradition by bringing food and flowers. They shared her grief and horror, but the news media reported no telephone calls from the White House, no word of a visit from the Vice President.

Only neighbors mourned the death of the American martyr for world peace.

Anniversary of the Independence of Rwanda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, on July 1, 1962, Rwanda became an independent republic. On this memorable occasion, therefore, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, Gregoire Kayibanda, President of the Republic of Rwanda; and to His Excellency, Celestin Kabanda, Rwanda's Ambassador to the United States.

During the 3 short years of statehood the people of this small country in East-Central Africa have made a great and successful effort to create a viable and democratic state.

Since its independence the Republic of Rwanda has been faced with many difficult tasks in the political, economic, and social realm. As part of its historic legacy the new state inherited a complicated landholding system, which dated as far back as the 15th century. Germany extended its zone of influence over Rwanda-Burundi as a result of the Berlin Conference of 1884-85. After the First World War, Belgium administered the area as a mandate under the League of Nations and subsequently as a U.N. trust territory. Neither power changed the feudal structure of the society. It was up to the leaders of the independent Republic of Rwanda to institute the needed socioeconomic reforms, and I am pleased to note the spirit of perseverance with which the government has embarked on this complicated task.

Rwanda is one of the most densely populated countries in Africa. Despite its relatively limited natural resources, Rwanda has reached the point where it is almost completely self-sufficient in its food supply. Its agriculture was modernized, production was increased and diversified. Thus, the disastrous famines of the past were overcome.

Following a complete review of its economic policies after independence, farsighted industrial development be-

gan; the transportation system was enlarged and hydroelectric powerplants were built.

The benefits of these and other programs have reached all the people. Whereas in 1954 all education was provided by religious missions and limited almost exclusively to primary grades, Rwanda now provided free education for all children between the ages of 7 and 16. In 1962-63 its school population totaled 350,000, many in new secondary schools and technical institutes—a truly admirable achievement. At the same time, a variety of programs of great social benefit were started: public health services were organized, and the training of doctors and nurses undertaken. Well-planned urban centers are growing, and new housing is provided for many.

In the years to come Rwanda will face many difficult tasks. Yet the experiences of the 3 past years cannot but lead us to believe that future obstacles will be overcome. Rwanda has taken the first steps with courage and success.

In pursuing a policy of international cooperation Rwanda has not only aided its own progress but has also set a fine example for the world. Agreements with the EEC, and pilot programs set up under the auspices of the United Nations give proof of Rwanda's commitment to international understanding. Though young in years, the Republic of Rwanda pursues a policy of great wisdom.

In short, the people of Rwanda can look with pride at the progressive development of their country, and Americans regard their efforts with approval. It is with the greatest pleasure that I congratulate Rwanda on the progress it has made. We admire the laudable goals and methods chosen by the people of Rwanda, and past evidence make us confident that the future will see even greater achievements.

Montana Stockmen Oppose User Charge for Soil Conservation Service Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a wide variety of interests throughout the Nation have appealed to Congress to oppose the Budget Bureau proposal to assess a user charge on Soil Conservation Districts, farmers, ranchers, and other landowners, for technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service.

Farmers, bankers, educators, contractors, businessmen, and many others have joined farm organizations and Soil and Water Conservation Districts in objecting to this proposal.

The Western Montana Stockmen's Association has joined the chorus of opposition. A resolution to that effect was

adopted by the association at its annual spring meeting, recently held at Ronan, Mont. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION

Whereas there is a greater need for soil conservation practices than ever before; and

Whereas under the present proposed budget set up by the Department of Agriculture, funds available for the Soil Conservation Service, will be \$20 million less than last year; and

Whereas to make up the \$20 million cut in the Soil Conservation Service budget, the Department of Agriculture will charge for technical assistance to those individuals requiring Soil Conservation Service: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Agriculture budget additional funds for soil conservation services.

Passed by the members of the Western Montana Stockmen's Association at their annual spring meeting held at Ronan, Mont., on May 1, 1965.

GEORGE TRIPP,

President, Niarada, Mont.

J. L. WILSON,

Chairman Resolutions Committee,

Whitepine, Mont.

RUTH STEARNS,

Secretary, Plains, Mont.

Student County Government Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I introduced a resolution requesting the President to proclaim a National Student Council Week. Today I would like to again call to the attention of Congress the activities of the Nation's youth in the field of government.

For the past 7 years, the Board of Freeholders of Bergen County in my district has sponsored an annual Student County Government Day. Bergen is believed to have been one of the first counties in the United States to establish such a program and its Public Information Department has on two occasions been awarded the George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for sponsorship of the project.

Student County Government Day in Bergen County involve students from the various schools taking the reins of government for the day-long period and working with their counterparts in their assigned duties. In the 1965 program, participating students met with county officials at an orientation night and were assigned specific county government projects, together with reference sources. Each student was also given an official handbook on county government outlining the duties and functions of government at the county level in Bergen.

A3488

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 1, 1965

A brief description of the day's activities from the 1965 report of the Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders follows:

A total of 176 students from 35 public and parochial high schools participated in Student County Government Day. This is the largest number of students and the largest number of high schools ever to participate. Students assembled in the Freeholder public meeting room and were instructed in how to use the voting machine. They followed regular voting procedures. Each student registered and received a voting slip before entering the voting machine. Here are the two questions on which they voted and the results:

(1) Should the legal drinking age in New York State be increased from 18 to 21?—no, 101; yes, 65.

(2) Should the voting age in New Jersey be lowered from 21 to 18?—no, 110; yes, 50.

The students were then taken by their official counterparts to their respective departments to learn about the operating of county government.

At noon a luncheon was served in the cafeteria of Bergen County Vocational and Technical High School for the students and their counterparts. From 2 to 3:15 p.m. student Freeholders and their counterparts held a caucus to arrange the meeting agenda. The public Freeholder meeting began at 3:15 p.m. with all the other nonparticipating students seated in the audience.

The meeting centered on the two questions on which all of the students had voted in the morning. A resolution memorializing the New York State Legislature to increase the drinking age from 18 to 21 was defeated 7 to 2. By the same majority the student Freeholders defeated a resolution memorializing the New Jersey Legislature to lower the voting age from 21 to 18.

All students and schools participating in the project were given awards and certificates and special recognition was given to the St. Cecilia High School student newspaper for "journalistic excellence in acquainting its readers with the aims of Bergen County Student Government Day and thereby helping foster an increased understanding of government."

High schools participating in the program included: Bergen Catholic, Bergen Tech, Bergenfield, Bogota, Cliffside Park, Don Bosco, Dumont, Dwight Morrow, Fair Lawn, Fort Lee, Hackensack, Hasbrouck Heights, Holy Angels Academy, Immaculate Conception, Immaculate Heart Academy, Leonia, Lodi, Mahwah, North Arlington, Northern Valley Regional, Pascack Hills, Pascack Valley, Ramapo Regional, Ridgely Memorial, Ridgely Park, Ridgewood, Riverdell Regional, Rutherford, Saddle Brook, St. Cecilia, St. Mary's, Teaneck, Tenafly, Wallington, and Wood-Ridge.

Irving N. Chayken Returns Medal to President de Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Hammond, Ind., Times, on Sunday,

June 27, 1965 carried a front page story regarding a prominent citizen of my district, Irving N. Chayken, returning a World War I Croix de Guerre Medal to President de Gaulle of France.

I think his actions reflect the minds of millions of American citizens, along with the majority of the citizens of France and other nations of the free world. I know that Mr. Chayken, in addressing his letter to President de Gaulle personally, did not include millions of French citizens who are in opposition to the dictatorial and ungrateful actions of the French President who is now completely noncooperative with the free world in curtailing the aggressions and spread of the international Communist conspiracy.

The following is a copy of the open letter of Mr. Chayken to President Charles de Gaulle of France:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CHARLES DE GAULLE
PRESIDENT OF FRANCE

DEAR PRESIDENT DE GAULLE: I note with great concern that you have undertaken a course of action that threatens the unity of the Western Powers. It appears you are determined to make France independent and to assume leadership of free Europe, which has rested with the United States since World War II.

You intend to withdraw France from the North Atlantic Alliance in 1969 and plan also to take steps to deprive the alliance and America, in particular, the right to use military installations and facilities on French soil except under national control of France.

You forget apparently, Mr. de Gaulle, that you spent 4 years in exile during World War II because France had been conquered by Germany and America's military forces were fighting at the other end hoping to restore France's freedom some day.

Americans are justified to complain about your lack of memory and in many places, regard you as an ingrate. France received a total of \$9,413,500,000 in economic and military aid since the war. In 1953 and 1954, France received military aid totaling \$1,107,900,000 and \$683,500,000 while battling bitterly to keep a toe hold in Indochina. The official U.S. Government publication, "U.S. Foreign Assistance, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1962" will bear out these figures.

Your attitude may not only prove disastrous to France and yourself but also to the entire free world. In event of a Russian attack, the free nations would be handcuffed trying to defend Western Europe on the ground.

Your memory is very poor, Mr. de Gaulle, when you forget the thousands of Americans who lost their lives or were wounded and permanently injured during World Wars I and II, defending the soil of France.

During World War I, the Croix de Guerre Medal was presented to me on the battlefield near Soissons, France, in July 1918, for helping to safety the wounded from my company that left 3 dead and 60 injured. I prized this citation for nearly 60 years and often recalled the glorious days with the 2d Division that fought not only for America but for the safety of France.

If you, Mr. de Gaulle, as President of France, now take a stubborn attitude against America and are forgetting your friends, then it is no longer and honor for me to keep this famous medal from the Government of France.

I am an American, first and always, and those who belittle this great Nation have no place in my heart after all that America has done to restore and preserve the freedom of France.

I am returning this medal to you, Mr. de Gaulle, because I can no longer have the re-

spect of the country that gave it to me. Such a medal is a citation that any soldier would cherish and treasure.

You are nothing but a major threat to the peace of the Western Hemisphere and of all people, the French should be most grateful to the American forces that shed their blood so that France may survive. I hope that my comrades in World War I will join me in returning their medals, too, to you so that you can be reminded of the sacrifices from America for the survival of the French people.

Sincerely,

IRVING N. CHAYKEN,
President.

W H Cuba Helstoski
Cuban Refugees Train as Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, Fairleigh Dickinson University recently was given a Federal grant to train Cuban refugees to be teachers of Spanish in New Jersey schools.

A feature article, written by Charles H. Harrison, education editor, appeared recently in the Record of Hackensack, N.J. It describes the effective program which has been organized by Fairleigh Dickinson University and how this grant will result in providing outstanding teachers for many of our school systems in New Jersey.

So that my colleagues can be aware of the value of this program I insert Mr. Harrison's article in the RECORD at this point:

CUBAN REFUGEES TRAIN AS TEACHERS AT FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY—UNIVERSITY AWARDED GRANT TO RUN INSTITUTE; SPANISH IS SUBJECT

(By Charles H. Harrison).

TEANECK.—An ambassador in the Batista regime in Cuba, who has been selling electrical appliances in Miami, is among 26 Cuban refugees who began yesterday training to be Spanish teachers in New Jersey schools.

Fairleigh Dickinson University was awarded a \$37,284 Federal grant to conduct the training institute. Another \$28,000 was made available to the refugees by the Federal Government on a loan basis. They will have to pay their own living expenses through September, when they are scheduled to take full-time jobs in New Jersey schools.

The majority of the 26 refugees were lawyers or teachers in Cuba before Castro took over. They are all college graduates. Dr. Emilio S. Cancio-Bello served as an ambassador to five Latin American countries under Batista from 1952 to 1959. He resigned the day after Castro took over on January 1, 1959.

The group will be enrolled in the master of arts in teaching program at Fairleigh Dickinson University, which prepares college graduates for teaching positions in high schools. The refugees' course of study will be slightly different, however.

Generally, those enrolled in the master of arts in teaching program spend the summer practice teaching under a master instructor and then become teaching interns for one semester the following school year. The second semester is spent in pursuing graduate studies in their major field.

The Cubans will complete the summer part of the program and then be granted an